


2006-01-01

The Influence of Issue Management Upon Public Relationships in a Changing Environment: How John Charles Mc. Quaid, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin (1940-72) Managed the Issue of the Second Vatican Council from 1959 to 1972 and the Extent, if any, to which this Influenced Change in the Public Relationships Between Archbishop, Diocesan Priests and Laity

Francis Xavier Carty
Technological University Dublin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/appadoc>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Communication Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carty, F. (2006) *The Influence of Issue Management Upon Public Relationships in a Changing Environment: How John Charles Mc. Quaid, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin (1940-72) Managed the Issue of the Second Vatican Council from 1959 to 1972 and the Extent, if any, to which this Influenced Change in the Public Relationships Between Archbishop, Diocesan Priests and Laity*. Doctoral Thesis, Technological University Dublin. doi:10.21427/D78C8H

This Theses, Ph.D is brought to you for free and open access by the Applied Arts at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@tudublin.ie, arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, brian.widdis@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)

The Influence of Issue Management upon Public Relationships in a Changing Environment:

**How John Charles McQuaid, Roman Catholic
Archbishop of Dublin (1940-72) managed the issue of
the Second Vatican Council from 1959 to 1972, and the
extent, if any, to which this influenced change in the
public relationships between archbishop, diocesan
priests and laity**

by

Francis Xavier Carty

**MA (NUI), BSc (Econ) University of London, BSc (NUI),
FPRII (Life), MCIPR, MIPRA, MEUPRERA**

Presented for award of PhD at

Dublin Institute of Technology, School of Media, March 2006

Supervisors:

Dr. Brian O'Neill

Dr. Jon White

Volume I (1-446) of II

ABSTRACT

This research examines the influence of issue management upon public relationships in a changing environment. The example chosen is the management of the Second Vatican Council, from 1959 to 1972, by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and the public relationships are those between archbishop, diocesan priests and laity. Public relations theories on issue management, publics and relationship management are applied to a religious context, one where relationships might be distorted by the religious faith, authority and obedience on which they are based, and which is different from the commercial business environment within which they were framed. The methodology is qualitative, interviews with 41 priests and laity who were participants or observers, and examination of archives, especially the Dublin Diocesan Archives. The findings force a fine distinction between broad stakeholder relationships and dynamic public relationships formed with both active and aware publics as the Council issue developed. Shifts in the broad stakeholder group relationships could not be proven, but there were shifts in the relationships involving aware and active publics on the Council issue. However, it could not be proved to what extent these shifts were the result of the Archbishop's handling of the issue as many other factors influenced change at the time. There was strong evidence that the media of communication influenced the relationships more than what the Archbishop said or did, as they were a driving force in popularising and explaining the Vatican Council. The findings can be seen as an illustration of emerging public relations field dynamics theory and the

complexity that surrounds issue and relationship management when there are numerous issues and numerous relationships interacting simultaneously in a changing, even turbulent, environment.

DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis which I now submit for examination for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is entirely my own work and has not been taken from the work of others save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work.

This thesis was prepared according to the regulations for postgraduate study by research of the Dublin Institute of Technology and has not been submitted in whole or in part for an award in any other Institute or University.

The work reported on in this thesis conforms to the principles and requirements of the Institute's guidelines for ethics in research.

The Institute has permission to keep, to lend or to copy this thesis in whole or in part, on condition that any such use of the material of the thesis be duly acknowledged.

Signature Franklin Xavier Carthy Date 10/3/06
Candidate

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To that eminent churchman
now deceased
who said:
*"I thank you for what you are doing.
There is great need for this work"*

And with thanks to many people and places for inspiration and help, including:

Father A; Anne Ambrose (DIT Library); Father B.; Fr. John P. Battelle; Biaggio's Ristorante and Pizzeria, Rupert St, London; Sam Black (RIP); BledCom, Slovenia, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2005; Eddie Brennan (DIT); John Brophy; John Brown; Aileen, Dick and Mary Bunyan; Gay Byrne; Fr. Tom Butler, SM; Father C.; Carraig Books, Blackrock; Janet Carton (DIT); Antonio, Ciarán, Francis J, Jack, Jane and Julia Carty; Ana, Emma, Rachel, Raymond and Stephanie Cassidy; Central Catholic Library; Gerald Chan (CIPR); CERP/IULM Conference, Milan, 2000; CIPR Research Conference, Bournemouth, 2003; CIPR Research Conference, Lincoln 2005; Fr. Martin Clarke; Tom Clonan (DIT); Mary Conway (DIT); Desmond Cardinal Connell; Tim Pat Coogan; Sinéad Copeland (DIT); Mgr. Patrick J. Corish; Ann-Marie Cotton (EUPRERA); Martin Cowley; Sinéad Coyne (DIT); Caitriona Crowe (NAI); Mgr. Jerome Curtin; Father D; Gerry Davis (PRII); Orla Diffily; Noelle Dowling (DDA); Pat Donlon; Dublin Institute of Technology Library (Aungier Street); Tom Duff (DIT); EUPRERA Conference, Warsaw, 2001; EUPRERA Conference, Estonia, 2003; Fr. Seán Fagan, SM; Fr. Seán Farragher, CSSp; Denise Farrell (DIT); Mgr. Tom Fehily; Sally-Anne Fisher (Trinity College, Dublin); Joseph Fitz-Patrick; Fr. Austin Flannery, OP; Joseph Foyle; Frankie & Bernie's Restaurant, Stansted Airport; Norman Freeman; John P. Gallagher (DIT); Vincent B. Gallagher; Garfunkel's Restaurant, Stansted Airport; Garfunkel's Restaurant, Heathrow Airport; Fr. J. Anthony Gaughan; Michael Gill; Séamus Grace (RIP); Mgr. Stephen Greene; Fr. Eltin Griffin, O.Carm; Alan Grossman (DIT); James E. Grunig (University of Maryland); Larissa A. Grunig (University of Maryland); Fr. Brendan Hally, CSSp; Verona S. Hanlon;

Ellen Hazelkorn (DIT); Séamus Helferty (UCD); Henry's, Piccadilly, London; Zöe Hibbert (Charles Sturt University, Australia); Kevin Hora (DIT); John Horgan (Dublin City University); Fr. Michael Hurley, SJ; Il Cucciolo Restaurant, Denman Street, London; IPRA Conference, Berlin, 2001; Julia Jahansoozi (University of Central Lancashire); James Joyce Library, UCD; John Paul II Library, NUI Maynooth; Susan Jenkins; Annmarie Jordan (PRII); Bob Kavanagh (DIT); Wil Keune; Lindara Kiely; Eric Koper (University of Central Lancashire); Frank Lane (DIT); David Lawlor; Ven. Archdeacon Patrick Leahy; Ann Lee; Teresa Lee (DIT); Fr. Aidan P. Lehane, CSSp; Virginia Lingstadt; Richard Linning; Little Italy Restaurant, Charing Cross Station, London; Elizabeth Lovatt-Dolan; Emer Lovett; Lund University, Sweden, Conference 2001; Yvonne Lynch; Fr. Dermot McCarthy; Julie McDonald; Ita McDonnell (University of London); Conor McGrath (University of Ulster); Frank McMahon (DIT); Mgr. J. Ardle MacMahon; John McMahon; Toby MacManus (Bournemouth University); Paula McNulty (Napier University); Archbishop John Charles McQuaid; Seán Mac Réamoinn; Louis McRedmond; Maeve McRedmond; Manning Selvage & Lee, Kensington Village; Pauline Madigan; Patrick Masterson; Mgr. John Moloney; Bishop Donal Murray; National Archives of Ireland; National Library of Ireland; Agnes Neligan (NUI Maynooth); Fr. Cormac O Brolchain, CSSp; Fr Michael O'Carroll, CSSp (RIP); Aonghus O hAonghusa, National Library of Ireland; Malachy O'Higgins (DIT); Carina O'Neill; Nicole O'Neill (DIT); Una O'Neill; Jan and Myles O'Reilly; Ponti's Restaurant, Stansted Airport; Con Power; Joseph F. Power (RIP); PRII National Conferences, 2003, 2004, 2005; Andy Purcell (University of Ulster); Ramada Jarvis Hotel, Ealing; Alan Rawel (CIPR) (RIP); Restauracija Panorama, Bled, Slovenia; David Phillips; David Rice; Alanna Riddell (University of Ulster); Ann & Derek Scott; David C. Sheehy (DDA); Ian Somerville (University of Ulster); Fr. Tom Stack; John Sweeney (DDA); Nora Pat and Trevor Stewart; Mgr. Owen Canon Sweeney; Myles Tierney; Tim Traverse-Healy; Joanne T. Treanor; Dejan Vercic (Pristop); Mgr. Conor K. Ward; Wetherspoons, Heathrow Airport; Jon White; Tony White; Jean Whyte; Teresa Whittington (Central Catholic Library).

ABBREVIATIONS

Assistant Priest (AP)

Catholic Communications Institute of Ireland (CCII)

Catholic Curate (CC)

Catholic Social Service Conference (CSSC)

Catholic Social Welfare Bureau (CSWB)

Catholic Truth Society of Ireland (CTSI)

Central Catholic Library (CCL)

Chartered Institute of Public Relations – UK (CIPR)

Church of Ireland (C of I)

Congregation of the Holy Spirit (Holy Ghost Fathers; Spiritans) (CSSp)

Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer (Redemptorists) (CSsR)

Dublin Diocesan Archives (DDA)

Dublin Diocesan Press Office (DDPO)

Dublin Institute of Adult Education (DIAE)

Dublin Institute of Catholic Sociology (DICS)

Electricity Supply Board (ESB)

European Public Relations Education and Research Association (EUPRERA)

Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA)

Institute of Public Administration (IPA)

International Public Relations Association (IPRA)

Irish Catholic Directory (ICD)

Literary & Historical Society (L & H)

Missionary Society of St. Columban (Maynooth Mission to China) (MMC)

Monsignor (Mgr)

National Archives of Ireland (NAI)

National Library of Ireland (NLI)

National University of Ireland (NUI)

Oblates of Mary Immaculate (OMI)

Order of Carmel (Carmelites) (OCarm)

Order of Friars Minor (Franciscans) (OFM)

Order of Preachers (Dominicans) (OP)

Order of St. Augustine (Augustinians) (OSA)

Order of St. Benedict (Benedictines) (OSB)

Parish Chaplain (PC)

Parish Priest (PP)

Pastor Emeritus (PE)

Public Image Committee (PIC)

Public Relations Field Dynamics (PRFD)

Public Relations Institute of Ireland (PRII)

Public Relations Officer (PRO)

Radio Teleffs Eireann (RTE) [Teleffs Eireann (TE) and Radio Eireann (RE) to 1965]

Society of Jesus (Jesuits) (SJ)

Society of Mary (Marists) (SM)

Student Christian Movement (SCM)

Trinity College, Dublin (TCD)

University College, Dublin (UCD)

Vicar General (VG)

CONTENTS – VOLUME I

1.	INTRODUCTION	7
	Title	7
	Context	7
	Aims and Objectives	11
	Boundaries	11
	Significance	14
	Validity	14
	Originality	15
	Researcher as Participant	16
	Chapter Outlines	17
2.	LITERATURE REVIEW	23
	Public Relations	23
	Management, Strategy and Leadership	26
	Faith, Authority, Power and Obedience	28
	Issues	31
	Issue Management	33
	Publics	43
	How Publics Behave	46
	Publics' Influence on Development of Issues	51
	Relationships	53
	Relationship Management	55
	Antecedents and Expectations	58

Relationship Indicators	59
Trust as a Fundamental Indicator	61
Cultivation Strategies	65
Relationships as Outcomes	69
Conclusion	76
3. METHODOLOGY	78
Research Design and Description	79
Interviews	80
Archives	85
Discussion on Methods	87
Classification for Findings and Discussion	96
4. JOHN CHARLES McQUAID – MAN AND MANAGER	100
A Holy Man	100
Spiritual Certitude	103
The Bishop's Duty	105
Insecurity	108
Shy, Remote, Formal	111
Wide Knowledge and Precision	112
Gentle and Courteous, Cold and Austere	113
His 'Enemies'	116
A Sense of Humour	125

5.	VATICAN 11 – EMERGENCE, 1959-1962	127
	Pope John XXIII Announces the Council	127
	Relational Antecedents and Expectations, 1959	129
	Preparing Dublin for the Council	134
	Radharc Television Documentaries	144
6.	VATICAN II – DISSEMINATION, 1962-1965	150
	The Four Sessions	150
	McQuaid at the Council	156
	Early Attitudes to the Council	172
	Theology for the Laity	176
	Early Council Documents	177
	Dublin Diocesan Press Office	184
	Media During the Council	190
7.	VATICAN II – ESTABLISHMENT, 1965-1968	201
	“No Change”	201
	Implementing Decisions of the Council	205
	Public Image Committee	215
	Collegiality	218
	“The Empty Chair”	223
	Ecumenism	231
	Mater Dei Institute	246
	Catechesis and Preaching	247

8.	VATICAN II – EROSION, 1968-1972	252
	<i>Humanae Vitae</i>	252
	Erosion of Council Enthusiasm	262
	Three Letters on Contraception	265
	Media after the Council	267
	Retiral and Death	273
9.	RELATIONSHIP INDICATORS	287
	Archbishop and Priests	287
	Archbishop and Laity	298
	Priests and Laity	301
10.	RELATIONAL CULTIVATION STRATEGIES	306
	Archbishop and Priests	306
	Archbishop and Laity	335
	Priests and Laity	361
	Communication as a Cultivation Strategy	364
11.	RELATIONAL CHANGE	369
	Change in McQuaid	371
	Archbishop and Priests	374
	Archbishop and Laity	378
	Priests and Laity	385

12.	DISCUSSION	392
	McQuaid – Man and Manager	392
	The Council Issue	395
	Stakeholder and Public Relationships	410
13.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	431
	Theoretical Relevance and Validity	431
	McQuaid – Man and Manager	433
	How McQuaid Managed the Council Issue	435
	Relationship Change	438
	Influence of McQuaid’s Council Issue Management upon	
	Public Relationships	441
	Final Reflections and Recommendations	442
	A Theoretical Diversion	445

CONTENTS – VOLUME II

REFERENCES – Archives	447
REFERENCES – Speech, Print, Broadcast, Internet	451
BIBLIOGRAPHY	469
APPENDICES	
A: Context	526
B: Relationship Indicators from the Literature	541
C: Research Artefacts	552
D: Archbishop McQuaid at Vatican II	571
E: Theoretical Model (2003)	584
CONFERENCES AND PUBLICATIONS	605
INDEX OF NAMES	607

1: INTRODUCTION

TITLE

The influence of issue management upon public relationships in a changing environment: How John Charles McQuaid, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin (1940-72) managed the issue of the Second Vatican Council from 1959 to 1972, and the extent, if any, to which this influenced change in the public relationships between archbishop, diocesan priests and laity.

CONTEXT

Pope John's Council

On 25 January 1959, ninety days after his election, 77-year-old Pope John XXIII made the completely unexpected announcement of his plan to convoke the Roman Catholic Church's Twenty-First Ecumenical Council, the first since Vatican I in 1869-1870. He hoped it would promote closer unity between his Church, the Orthodox Christian churches which divided in the 11th century and the other Christian churches which emerged from the 16th century Protestant Reformation. In the immediate term, he saw it as an attempt by the Church to update itself, insofar as that would be found necessary, in interpretation and presentation of its doctrines, its liturgical and devotional ceremonial, disciplinary practices and its administration. The Italian word *aggiornamento* (updating) came to symbolise much of the Pope's thinking on the Council and he referred to it often as an opening of

the windows in the Vatican to let in some fresh air. He was anxious that it would lead the Church to engage more positively with the modern world, as it had displayed an attitude of defence – even a siege mentality – and of reaction and suspicion to what was new in the world since the trauma of the Reformation and the Council of Trent (1545-1563).

The Council was attended by almost all of the 2,500 Catholic bishops, with certain dignitaries and invited observers from other churches. It held four sessions in Rome in the autumns of 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965. Pope John died in June 1963 and his successor, Pope Paul VI, saw the Council to its completion. It examined a succession of issues confronting the Church, often in animated and even contentious manner, in closed sessions which were conducted entirely in the Latin language. However, its deliberations did not remain secret and, by the later sessions, the world knew exactly who had said what soon after the meetings. There resulted 16 documents on topics ranging from The Church, Liturgy, Ecumenism, Priestly Formation, Missions and Religious Freedom to the Church in the Modern World. These documents were voted on and passed by the bishops and signed by the Pope to become official Catholic Church teaching. Subsequently, directives for their implementation were issued by the Roman Curia (the Vatican Civil Service) and implemented, through national hierarchies, by the bishops in their dioceses. The momentum of change created by the Council and the documents was such that many more changes came that were not specifically included in the documents, but seen as part of the spirit and intention of the Council.

Sources include: Kung 1961, 1963a, 1963b, 2003; Kaiser 1963, 2002; Rynne 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966; Hales 1965; McKenzie 1966).

Archbishop McQuaid

John Charles McQuaid (1895-1973) was Archbishop of Dublin from 1940 to 1972. This thesis will support the view of numerous authors (e.g. Feeney 1974; Cooney 1999; D.McMahon 2000) that he was an excellent administrator and noted for his care of the poor and the less privileged people in society. He was theologically conservative and retained an authoritarian style of management and attitude towards the office of bishop that was still common and generally accepted at all levels in society.

Dublin's archbishops, since the 12th century, have tended to adopt strong and often individual positions. A recent history of the diocese (Kelly and Daire Keogh, eds., 2000) shows how their ecclesiastical primacy has not always been recognised, but their proximity to the seat of political power, and Dublin's position as the most populous diocese, has given them a *de facto* dominance. McQuaid was chosen into this tradition, not from the priests of the diocese, but from a religious congregation, the Holy Ghost Fathers, where he had been President of Blackrock College secondary school for boys. He remained one of the most prominent, and controversial, Irish churchmen of the 20th century, often influencing government policy and national thinking, contributing to the drafting of the Irish Constitution in 1937 and being the central figure in the clash with Dr. Noël Browne, Minister for Health, over a Mother and Child medical scheme in 1951, which

led to the fall of the Government (Whyte 1971, 1980; Browne 1986; Horgan 2000 and others).

The changing Ireland of the 1960s

In 1959, Eamon de Valera was succeeded as Taoiseach (Prime Minister) by Seán Lemass, bringing to an end the era that started with the Easter Rising of 1916. There were major changes in government policy and Ireland's relationship with the world. The new government strategy was to encourage overseas industry with generous grant-aid. This led to job creation, a reversal of the emigration trend after more than a hundred years and a new prosperity. The inauguration of the national television station, Telefís Éireann, on 31 December 1961, was a catalyst for debate and the broadening of views, opinions, attitudes and values. Free secondary education was introduced in 1967, leading to a major expansion in secondary and third level education. Through the 1960s Ireland moved along the path to the European Economic Community and became a full member on 1 January 1973. Violence in Northern Ireland eased in the early 1960s but arose again from 1968 in response to the civil rights issue, the emergence of the Provisional IRA and similar paramilitary groups on the unionist side. In 1972 the Article in Bunreacht na hÉireann (The Constitution of Ireland), that recognised the 'special position' of the Catholic Church, was removed by referendum.

(See Appendix A, p. 526, for further context)

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The aims of this thesis were to examine how the Archbishop managed the issue of the Vatican Council and its aftermath, and whether this influenced change in the triangle of public relationships between Archbishop, diocesan priests and laity from the Pope's announcement of the Council in January 1959 to McQuaid's retirement in January 1972.

The objectives were to conduct in-depth interviews with at least 36 priests and laity who were in the Dublin diocese during the 1960s, and to examine the McQuaid papers in the Dublin Diocesan Archives, and other archival and secondary sources, to find material relevant to the aims of the thesis.

BOUNDARIES

McQuaid was a prominent and frequently controversial leader in Irish and Dublin life through more than thirty years as Archbishop. This thesis is limited to his relationships with diocesan priests, seminarians and laity because these alone were his direct and exclusive responsibility in terms of ecclesiastical governance. It would have been interesting to consider his relationships with, for instance, other Irish bishops, diocesan priests from other dioceses, and priests, nuns and brothers from religious orders, as influenced by the Vatican Council issue, but inclusion of such groups would have involved examination of numerous other issues not directly related to the overall research aims.

The experiences and evidence of some priests and laity, who were observers but not participants in the chosen relationships, have been included in the interviews and used in both the presentation of, and discussion on, the findings. The relationships between priests and between members of the laity are not examined.

Processes and outcomes of the theological debates engendered by the Council are indicated, but it is not within the scope of the thesis to adjudicate on the theological issues, nor to resolve disagreement on them, nor to determine the correctness of McQuaid's own theological positions. The implementation of the Council's decisions was still ongoing when McQuaid retired in 1972.

One issue, which preceded the Council and then became its by-product, was the Church's ban on artificial contraception. Pope Paul VI withdrew the topic from consideration at the Council and, in 1968, retained the ban in an encyclical letter, *Humanae Vitae*. The linkage of this issue with the Council, and its impact in McQuaid's final years, are the reasons for including it here.

McQuaid's handling of certain issues which have been recently topical, such as child sex abuse, child adoption, conditions in orphanages, industrial schools (reformatories) or convent-run laundries, are not considered here. Such examination would take the focus away from the Council and stretch the timescale of the research back to earlier years of McQuaid's episcopacy.

Some interviewees raised aspects of these issues but their evidence was not of sufficient strength to draw conclusions.

This is not a study of Catholic Church power and influence in Irish politics and society, which were given a firm anchor in the era of Paul Cardinal Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin (1852-1878), and continued to the 1950s. Many scholarly works have established the evidence of this power and influence, which McQuaid used to the full (Lyons 1971; Whyte 1971, 1980; Bowen 1983; Lee 1989; Dermot Keogh 1994, 1995; James Kelly and Daire Keogh 2000; Morrissey 2000; Garvin 2004 and others).

This is not a biography of McQuaid. An extended essay by Feeney (1974) attempted an assessment and a full-length work by Cooney (1999b) was informative, well-researched and attracted considerable controversy. Feeney (who died in an air crash in 1985) was a student activist and journalist in the 1960s and Cooney came to Ireland from Scotland in the 1970s to be a reporter on *The Irish Times*.

This thesis is based mainly on in-depth interviews and archival sources, especially the Dublin Diocesan Archives, which the then Archbishop, Desmond Cardinal Connell, opened on a phased basis from 1998. Secondary sources, especially those deriving from participants, have been used in the narrative to complement the primary material.

SIGNIFICANCE

Ferguson (1984) called for attention to relationship management as an area of public relations research and writers in the USA, notably Broom, Ledingham, Bruning, Heath, Wilson, Hon, J.Grunig, and L.Grunig, have taken it up. Academic textbooks, prior to Heath (2001) and L.Grunig et al (2002), referred often to publics but rarely to relationships, which, when mentioned, were not indexed. A mass media/communications rationale for public relations, popular for many years, has had a limiting affect upon the discipline with its emphasis on the 'publics' aspect of public relations. More attention is now being given to 'relations' and a relationship/communitarian rationale which emphasises community empowerment, dialogue, building symmetric relationships and corporate social responsibility.

VALIDITY

One might ask if

- issues and relationships can be managed in the literal sense of the word
- it is valid to examine an experience and an issue that pre-dated modern formulations, and
- it is valid to apply research findings on issues and relationships to a context unlike those in which previous research has been done.

The Catholic Church, whether represented as the Holy See and the Roman Curia, based in the Vatican, or a national conference of bishops (or

hierarchy), or a diocese, or a parish, is a management unit, admittedly of a special type, but with human, financial and other resources that have to be managed efficiently to achieve both its spiritual and temporal goals. Most research on these topics, to date, has been within the United States and in commercial industrial environments.

ORIGINALITY

This thesis is original and adds to the body of knowledge because it examines and discusses emerging theories in a context different from that in which they were framed and creates another aspect from which to discuss the research of Chase, Grunig, Ledingham, Bruning, Heath and others. Some indicators of the relationships between an archbishop and his priests and laity, and the emphasis on authority and faith, are different from those experienced in other organisational/public relationships, and this could weaken an attempt to support, amend or reject theories, but the results can give additional insight into the theories and, possibly, some indication of their strength.

This thesis is original also because it helps to construct a piece of social history from a period of rapid change in Irish society. Several of the interviewees are among the small number of survivors from McQuaid's circle of friends and some of them are on record here for the first time with their memories and interpretations of what they witnessed. Also, the

archives have revealed interesting and relevant documents and letters that have not been used in previously published work.

The Dublin Diocesan Archives contain some 700 boxes on McQuaid alone, but they can be frustrating because there were not photocopiers until the final few years, and earlier letters were carbon-copied or re-written by hand and preserved only if important for subsequent reference to decisions taken or precedents created. One has to wonder, apart from thousands of telephone calls, what McQuaid wrote in many untraced letters to provoke the comments and responses that are often in the replies. The Burke Savage letters, for example, are illuminating. In many cases, however, we have the comments which McQuaid wrote on letters received, sometimes as points for reply but very often just his first thoughts and memory aids for his own reference.

RESEARCHER AS PARTICIPANT

I played a small part in the events described here. I was a student for the priesthood (1958–65) in the Holy Ghost Congregation (where McQuaid had been a priest until he became Archbishop); a newspaper and magazine journalist specialising in religious reporting, mainly for the *Irish Press* (1965–70); and editor/writer for Veritas Publications, a division of the Catholic Communications Institute (1970–71). I have known several of the interviewees since the 1960s.

CHAPTER OUTLINES

2: Literature Review

The literature review considers the development of three concepts: issue management, publics and relationship management. These provide the theoretical framework within which the research is placed. They introduce principles, models and processes which are developed as tools for examination of the findings. Public relations theory is relatively recent and some of the influences on this theory are found in earlier research and published works especially in psychology, communication, sociology and general management. Foundation theorists for these topics include Chase, Ewing, J.Grunig, Broom, Ledingham, Bruning, Wilson and Heath in the USA; Vercic, van Ruler and Bentele in mainland Europe and White, Moss and L'Etang in the UK. Relevant public relations literature on the Catholic Church, or religion in general, has not been found in any great quantity. The literature review does not seek to explore gaps in the literature or to develop a new synthesis.

3: Methodology

This project has been a voyage of discovery and the methodology builds the platform for presentation of, and discussion on, the findings. The research design and its implementation are essential for the validity of the entire project. It is the link between the academic principles and processes, outlined in the literature review, and the subsequent chapters which consider their application and relevance to the primary and secondary data.

4: John Charles McQuaid – Man and Manager

This first chapter of findings portrays aspects of McQuaid as man and manager, with the seven following chapters focusing on him in specific issue management and relationship management contexts. McQuaid was dedicated to his work as Archbishop, never off-duty, a man who showed an unfailing concern for the sick, the poor and the under-privileged, but combined this with a grandiose, sometimes renaissance-like courtly style, and the authoritarian approach to management that was usual at the time, with a rigid insistence on discipline and obedience, especially in small matters.

5: Vatican II – Emergence, 1959-1962

This chapter starts the narrative of the Vatican Council issue through the four life-cycle stages of emergence, dissemination, establishment and erosion. It also sets the context by taking the antecedents and initial expectations in relationships between archbishop, priests and laity. Ireland, in general, was unprepared for the Council, with the bishops unaware of what it might involve, but seeds were being sown, which would help priests and laity to understand the years ahead for the Catholic Church and its role in the modern world, the most prominent of which were two religious and social journals, *The Furrow* and *Doctrine & Life*.

6: Vatican II – Dissemination, 1962-1965

The core of the narrative is the Council meetings in Rome in the autumns of 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965. The bishops of the Catholic Church, in full ceremonial dress, came to examine the issues and showed their differences in a direct manner which took many people by surprise. McQuaid is seen as very diligent, but shocked by what was happening, never at ease with it, and then accepting it as the work of the Holy Spirit within his Church and voting in favour of the final documents. The media are seen not to have made the Council into an issue but to have moved it along, with the co-operation of liberal bishops and their advisers, forcing a new transparency and accountability in the central governing authority of the Church which eventually percolated to local level.

7: Vatican II – Establishment, 1965-1968

McQuaid found the aftermath difficult, feeling there was more change coming than was ever intended by the Council. He diligently, but cautiously, implemented the directives he received from Rome, but would go no further. Impatience grew among certain sections of his priests and laity and there were frequent media attacks but he stood his ground with strong support from many of the older priests. He pioneered some initiatives in the diocese – Diocesan Press Office, Council of Priests, new commissions, Mater Dei Institute, for example, but he was most concerned that the 'simple faithful' would not be confused or disturbed in their traditional faith or religious practice.

8: Vatican II – Erosion, 1968-1972

Pope Paul VI's encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*, confirming the ban on artificial contraception, had a shattering impact on the Catholic Church. This chapter traces its fall-out and the simultaneous erosion of enthusiasm for the Council. Contraception was not just a theological issue for discussion in pastoral letters, but one which affected millions of Catholics. McQuaid was cautious in the way he dealt with dissidents, trying to keep a united team of priests. But it was all over for him and he probably realised that, with advancing age, the world was leaving him behind. He was disappointed that the Pope promptly accepted his compulsory offer of resignation on reaching the age of 75, but asked for another year and got it. He went into a lonely retirement where he was ignored by many and died after just one year.

9: Relationship Indicators

Following Ledingham, Bruning and others, this chapter examines the indicators, or dimensions, of the relationships with a strong emphasis on trust as shown in loyalty and obedience, which was very evident in the Dublin archdiocese. This trust was mixed with a great fear which priests of all ages and positions seemed to have for McQuaid but this was a time when many people feared their bosses.

10: Relational Cultivation Strategies

The three sets of public relationships, with special attention to the Archbishop's side, are examined for strategies which could be seen to have

cultivated and improved them, or just maintained or, possibly, damaged them. There is evidence of McQuaid's ability to mix an authority-driven approach and strict discipline with extreme kindness. Relationships with some specific stakeholder groups are used to illustrate the general points from each strategy heading and to identify patterns.

11: Relational Change, 1959-1972

This final chapter of findings considers relational outcomes, that is, changes in strength of the indicators within the three sets of relationships. It is concerned with changes that might have resulted, or at least been influenced, by the manner in which McQuaid handled the Council issue. Such changes were not easy to detect in the general stakeholder groups but were clearer among those who were active publics with regard to the Council and its aftermath. It is suggested that attitudes of active and aware publics towards McQuaid may have been more influenced by the media of communication than by any actions or words of McQuaid.

12: Discussion

The findings are discussed through the theoretical principles and processes described in the literature review. To what extent do they reveal good practice on issue and relationship management? How efficiently and convincingly did the methodology and research design deliver an answer to the overall research question? It would seem, again, that the shift in overall stakeholder relationships, if any, could not be attributed to the Council issue, but there was some influence on relationships with active and aware

publics. There is a strengthening of the suggestion that the relationships may have been influenced less by what McQuaid did and said, and by how he imposed his teaching authority, and more by the overall involvement of the media of communication.

13: Conclusions and Recommendations

There follows a final summary of conclusions that may be drawn from the findings and discussion, followed by some reflections and recommendations for further research.

2: LITERATURE REVIEW

THIS CHAPTER considers the development of three concepts, common in public relations literature, which provide underpinning for the theoretical framework within which this research is placed. It also looks at models proposed and processes developed which can be used as tools for examination of the findings. These concepts are issue management, publics and relationship management. Foundation theorists for these topics include Chase, Ewing, J.Grunig, Broom, Ledingham, Bruning, Wilson and Heath in the USA; Vercic, van Ruler and Bentele in mainland Europe and White, Moss and L'Etang in the UK. Relevant public relations literature on the Catholic Church, or religion in general, has not been found in any great quantity. The literature review does not seek to explore gaps in the literature or to develop a new synthesis.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Definitions

Many definitions of public relations have been more accurately descriptions of elements in the public relations process than attempts to understand the eventual outcome of public relations activity which, by growing agreement, is its impact upon public relationships.

Cutlip, Center & Broom give a definition which is in line with current research:

Public relations is the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organisation and the publics on whom its success or failure depends (1994:6; 2000:6).

Grunig & Hunt attempted a more simple definition and saw public relations as the “management of communication between an organisation and its publics”(1984:6). This approach would seem to apply more to process than to outcome. Kent & Taylor have noticed a “theoretic shift” from emphasis on managing communication to communication as a tool for negotiating relationships (2002:23).

The UK Chartered Institute of Public Relations had a longstanding definition (modified over the years) that “public relations is the planned and sustained attempt to establish and maintain goodwill and mutual understanding between an organisation and its publics”. This was overridden by a new definition in 1992 that public relations is “about reputation, the result of what you do, what you say and what others say about you” and which described public relations practice as “the discipline which looks after reputation – with the aim of earning understanding and support, and influencing opinion and behaviour”. The older definition has been restored exclusively, and with some disagreement among the members, in the Royal Charter for the Institute (2005:6).

The association between public relations and reputation remains strong and there are many apt quotations on reputation ranging from the Bible to

Shakespeare and others. Charles Fombrun has emerged as a foundation theorist on the modern relevance of reputation and how businesses can manage the often hidden asset of reputational capital to give them a distinct competitive advantage (Fombrun 1996).

The Bled Manifesto states: "Public relations is the (maintenance of) relationships (with) publics (by) communication (in order to) establish mutual understanding" (van Ruler & Vercic, 2002:13). This is, however, a compromise based on a Delphi survey from each country of Europe where some saw the terms 'communication' and 'relationship' as interchangeable, just as Grunig & Hunt (1984) and others seemed to see 'communication' and 'public relations' as interchangeable.

Heath, in line with Broom, Dozier and others, sees public relations practitioners through roles of problem solvers, counsellors, tacticians and technicians (2005d:680). Leeper considered the view, advocated by Kruckeberg and Starck (1988), that the concept of community should be used as the basis for the theory and practice of public relations. He notices the influence of this approach in the greater attention now being given to social responsibility, stewardship and non-profit development (2005:168-9).

MANAGEMENT, STRATEGY AND LEADERSHIP

Management

Management can mean either the people who manage an organisation or what they do, but beyond that there are many divergences within the literature. Ewing refers to its 'normal' usage in the business world, "the ability to significantly control and direct"(1987:22). Greenhalgh suggests that 'traditional' management styles are more typically Western and that "generations of Western managers abandoned the naturally occurring communal organisation that had prospered for centuries"(2001:124) and replaced it with "hierarchical organisations hamstrung by adversarial relationships"(2001:130-1). Handy warns against a rigour in organisational culture and structure which thinks that "the centre knows best, that discretion is dangerous and that local differences are unnecessary"(1994:109). Greenhalgh focuses on management as "managing business relationships – relationships with peers, workers, bosses, suppliers, customers, regulators, competitors, and various stakeholders"(2001:ix). Bibb & Kourdi believe the concept of 'the manager', by its very nature, "opposes the belief that you can trust people. The manager's job, in most organisations, is to control and monitor others and their work"(2004:54). Heath sees control as a central part of human experience and accepts it as a basic principle of management that "executive managements of companies want to control as many factors as possible that enhance their chance of success". He believes the balance between the control exerted by each party

in a relationship is subject to the perceptions and expectations of each party (2005b:194).

Strategy

Strategy can have numerous meanings. Moss & Warnaby found that, despite the large volume of literature about strategy, "a comprehensive, consensus definition of strategy has remained elusive"(1997:45-6). They considered how Mintzberg (1991:12) extended it beyond the planning perspective to see it also as a pattern, a position, a perspective, and a ploy. Sharing the views of others (White & Dozier, 1992; Cutlip *et al*, 1994), Moss & Warnaby found that "a broad consensus exists within the management literature, that strategy is essentially concerned with a process of managing the interaction between an organisation and its external environment so as to ensure the best 'fit' between the two"(1997:45; 2000:59).

Roots

Some writers see the roots of modern management strategy in the distant past. Woolfe (2002) has drawn examples from the Bible, especially the Old Testament, where he found honesty and integrity, purpose, kindness and compassion, humility, communication, performance management, team development, courage, justice and fairness, and leadership development. Bose (2003) points to ancient Greece and Alexander the Great's information gathering, attention to detail, not competing in arenas where he could not control the situation, securing an exit route and decentralisation. He refers to Alexander's trusting leadership which evoked fierce loyalty from those

around him. It is suggested that many military and business figures of history have modelled themselves on Alexander. Dollard *et al* (2002) found modern ideas of management in St. Benedict's Rule for his monks, written in the sixth century and still used today. There is an emphasis on fairness where the Abbot is told he "must manage everything...so that the strong may have ideals to inspire them and the weak may not be frightened" and an emphasis also on trust and a respect for others and on striving for a reasonable balance to achieve win/win outcomes in all relationships"(2002:28).

FAITH, AUTHORITY, POWER AND OBEDIENCE

Chambers defines authority as "power derived from office or character or prestige"(1983:82); power as "right to command, authority: rule: influence: control"(1983:1007); obedience as "the act of doing what one is told; willingness to obey commands"(1983:870). In more recent literature Bibb & Kourdi, for instance, hold that "managers who pursue power and try to control others may actually be looking for recognition and confirmation that they are, themselves worthwhile". There is suggestion that use of power to control others can often rest upon personal insecurity (2004:64).

Religious perspective

Authority and power are understood differently in the Catholic Church than in civil society in that whatever power the pope or bishop has is believed to be a direct result of the authority entrusted to him by God on his

consecration. The exercise of authority and the use of power presuppose this belief, or faith, and its natural result is obedience to God's representatives.

Pope Paul VI saw the Church's authority as established by Christ with faith as the starting point of obedience. This faith confers upon him who commands and upon him who obeys "the merit of being like Christ who 'was made obedient even unto death'". Paul considered obedience as "the observance of canonical regulations and respect for the government of lawful superiors" and that "a spirit of independence, bitter criticism, defiance, and arrogance is far removed from that charity which nourishes and preserves the spirit of fellowship, harmony and peace in the Church". He believed that such a spirit "vitiates dialogue, turning it into argument, disagreement and dissension"(1964:114-5).

Vatican Council

These concepts feature prominently in the documents of Vatican II. The *Constitution on the Church* says ministers "who are endowed with sacred power are servants of their brethren..."(1965:18); bishops, with their priests and deacons, "have taken up the service of the community, presiding in place of God over the flock, whose shepherds they are, as teachers for doctrine, priests for sacred worship, and ministers for governing"(1965:20); bishops "by divine institution" have succeeded to the place of the apostles as shepherds of the Church (1965:20); the Pope, as the successor of Peter, "is the perpetual and visible principle and foundation of unity of both the bishops and of the multitude of the faithful"(1965:23); "the preaching of the

Gospel occupies an eminent place" among the duties of bishops (1965:25); and bishops have "the sacred right and the duty before the Lord to make laws for their subjects, to pass judgement on them and to moderate everything pertaining to the ordering of worship and the apostolate"(1965:27). The *Decree on Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church* states that in their dioceses the bishops, as successors of the Apostles, have "all the ordinary, proper and immediate authority which is required for the exercise of their pastoral office"(1965:8) (See Abbott, 1967).

Rahner & Vorgrimler say bishops must not be regarded as officials or representatives of the Pope, having, rather, "their own proper authority derived from Christ" and the bishop rules his diocese "as chief shepherd (teaching of doctrine, charitable works, cure of souls and its supervision, legislative and judicial power, administration of temporalities, etc)"(1965:8). McKenzie says "we do not have power first and then a society in which power may be exercised; first we have the society with its own end, and then authority as one of the means by which the end is achieved". If authority is in opposition to the end of the society, then "disobedience rather than obedience becomes not only a right but a duty"(1966:7). He sees the Church as a free association in the sense that "its members join by a free, personal decision...Yet no one can seriously maintain that the authority of the Church is based on the contractual agreement of its members"(1966:12). He says the Church's emphasis on obedience and due submission to authority, common nowadays, is explained historically as a defensive reaction to the Reformers who "rejected the authority of the Church and

withdrew themselves from its obedience"(1966:14). Pointing out that democracy is the one form of rule that the Church has not yet attempted, he says Jesus left no instructions on how the Church should be governed...he left instructions on how the Church is not to be governed, and that is according to the model of secular power (1966:32). McKenzie identifies words commonly associated with authority, such as command, direction, control and the like, as coming from general human experience which moves men to think of authority in the first place as a restraining influence and of freedom as the absence of constraint (1966:91). He further comments that "the transformation of the Church into a power structure is not a confirmation of authority, but a perversion of authority"(1996:97).

Müller holds that "devotion to the Pope as it has developed in the last decades is probably unique in Church history; it has been due in part to the personality of recent Popes, but it has certainly given an unbalanced picture of the Church"(1966:47). He says authority should be exercised as a service to "all Christians united in brotherly love", for they pursue the same ends and are interested in the same tasks as the hierarchy. It should not be said that these ends and interests affect only an elite and not the mass of the faithful"(1966:152).

ISSUES

Chase describes an issue as "an unsettled matter which is ready for decision"(1984:38), Lesly sees it as "a matter in dispute" and an emerging

issue "as a matter that shows signs of developing into a dispute"(1991:23). White considers all issues, broadly, as "matters of public concern - potential or actual"(1991:59). Vercic & J.Grunig, citing Eadie (1989:172), see a strategic issue as "a problem or opportunity" which, if action is not taken on it now, is likely to "saddle the organisation with unbearable future costs"(2000:42). Whether viewed primarily as a problem or an opportunity, it seems that there are often two sides to an issue, but not necessarily severe disagreement or conflict. For Heath & Nelson, "an issue is a contestable question of fact, value or policy"(1986:37). Kitchen accepts the definition of an issue as "a point of conflict between an organisation and one or more of its publics" (1997:33, citing Hainsworth 1990).

Issue as crisis

Center & Jackson hold that "when issues get out of hand – that is, cannot be settled before they become huge and threatening – they move to the category of crisis"(1995:314). Former US politician, Henry Kissinger, is oft-quoted but never sourced for his view that "an issue ignored is a crisis ensured".

Public and private issues

Research often implies that an issue has to be public (White 1991; Center & Jackson 1995; Baskin *et al* 1997; Hallahan 2001). Hallahan holds that disputes can be private but "issues involve disagreements that occur in public"(2001:28). Berger looked at the public/private question and found that for private issues "the number of political actors is theoretically small,

and the range of interests of such actors is narrow" but also found no "clearly visible" line between the private and the public, saying that "no public policy issue is actually private, but the rhetorical distinction between the two issue types is useful"(2001:98-100).

ISSUE MANAGEMENT

American public relations consultant, W.Howard Chase is often acknowledged as the "father of issues management"(Ewing 1987:13). It was Chase (1976) who first used the term "public issues management". The 'new' discipline spread rapidly, first in the USA and then elsewhere so that Renfro could say: "Like all successes, it has many fathers"(1990:20).

Definitions

Since Chase, there have been many attempts to define issue management. Some are modest in the claims they make for the 'new' discipline, and emphasise the monitoring of the environment for emerging issues and planning how the organisation will respond to them. Others seek to direct and control the progress of the issue and at times imply a manipulative process over the outside creators of the issue and the actors involved in its development. The literature stresses the importance of early issue identification and analysis. Hearit finds it central to Chase that we must not ignore the causal relationships between known trends and predictable events (2005:122-4). Chase defines issue management, in ambitious fashion, as "the capacity to understand, mobilise, co-ordinate and direct all strategic

and policy planning functions and all public affairs/public relations skills towards achievement of one objective that affects personal and institutional destiny”(1982). Seymour & Moore take an equally ambitious but different approach, that “issues management is the attempt to form and shape public opinion on subjects which both the communicator and audience deem of wider concern to society”(2000:161). Baskin *et al* reflect many other writers when they define issue management as “the identification of key issues confronting organisations and the management of organisational responses to them”(1997:48). Heath stresses the importance of communication in issue management on the assumption that “the voice of large organisations needs to be heard on policy issues”(2005c:460). Reichart sees expectational gaps between corporate behaviour and the perceptions and expectations of some stakeholder groups or larger society as “fundamental to issue creation” (2003:58). Since Chase, authors use the terms issue and issues management interchangeably. Issue management is preferred in this study.

Why issue management?

Issue management arose in the 1970s as a response to changing regulatory and business climates. Chase says “past methods weren’t working to bridge the chasm between business and society”(1984:17-8). He did not claim to have invented a new concept but was proposing a planned approach to public relations rather than the haphazard, *ad hoc* approach that had been fashionable (1984:16). Ewing says issue management evolved to overcome a serious corporate weakness which most senior officers became acutely aware of in the 1960s and 1970s: “They learned a simple lesson the hard

way: ignorance gets corporations, like people, into trouble; arrogance keeps them there"(1987:7). There has been a growing emphasis on how issue management can benefit society with Pratt, following Heath and others, holding that a new generation of issue managers' intention is "not merely to influence an organisation's publics but also to change the organisation's practices, making them more responsive to the public interest"(2001:336).

Issue management and reputation

One reason for the emergence of the issue management concept in the US in the 1970s was the damage being done by muck-raking journalists to the reputations of corporations (Haywood 1994: 180, and others). The image, or reputation, of a firm may take years, or even decades, to develop. For Regester & Larkin, such an image or reputation can easily be shattered unless the firm has a clearly defined, structured and comprehensive set of planning procedures for how to act in particular situations" (1997a: 220). Seitel suggests that issue management might be another way of saying reputation management, "orchestrating the process whose goal is to help preserve markets, reduce risks, create opportunities and manage image as an organisational asset for the benefit of both an organisation and its primary shareholders" (1995: 442, citing Tucker & Broom 1993).

Selecting issues

K.Traverse-Healy considers public affairs and public relations to be "all about issue selection and issue management, coupled with the management of the corporate perception process and the correction of incorrect

perceptions. Only when the range of issues has been considered can those few that are likely to affect the achievement of bottom-line targets be isolated"(1995:6). It is suggested that not every issue can be tackled at the same time and that priorities have to be set.

Early warning system

Heath points to earlier optimism that everything could be solved through issue management, but points to agreement that such management can create an early warning system which will help the organisation to manage its responses to issues as they emerge and mature or decay (2001b:462). Baskin *et al* also consider the early warning system aspect of issue management (1997:80) and Center & Jackson the need to see issues coming and reach ways to accommodate with them "before they become public and hot"(1995:321). T.Traverse-Healy places emphasis on "forecasting the likely future impact of issues on an organisation and advising management how to respond to them"(1994:3). Ewing holds that forecasting in these circumstances cannot be an exact science and the role of perceptions in issue management also makes it difficult to forecast what will happen (1987:1). One tries to anticipate any possible shift in perception and role among stakeholders and publics (Varey 1998:134), but perceptions and ideas are "perhaps fortunately, nebulous", according to Seymour & Moore, who see them as "shifting, constantly adapting and resistant to easily quantifiable consumer-based strategies of 'hard sell'"(2000:167).

Issue life cycle

Issues can be examined through the life cycle concept, one that was originally seen in a philosophical and cosmological sense which pre-dates the existence of life. There, it is always a circle, consistent with the cosmos being "the world or universe as an orderly or systematic whole – opposite to chaos"(Chambers 1983:283). Many authors (including Ewing 1987; Hainsworth & Meng 1988; Regester & Larkin 1997a, 1997b; Femers *et al* 2000) depict the issue life cycle in linear fashion. Many issues have a clear origin and resolution and this is illustrated linearly with contemporary examples, notably by Regester & Larkin (1997b: 47-62). However, there are other issues which do not necessarily die, but when apparently resolved, they can go dormant; and therein lies the seed of their re-emergence in another form and another context. P.Murphy would seem to favour the cyclical models in which the elements revolve as in a wheel (2000:458).

The Vatican Council issue, from its origin in 1959, was destined to be a landmark for the Catholic Church and to become embedded in history, difficult to assess in the short-term and going through continuous cycles for years to come. Therefore, its appropriate depiction would seem to be circular.

Various terms are used to describe the stages in the issue life cycle. They include: societal expectations, political developments, legislative actions and regulation/litigation (Ewing 1987:50); origin, mediation/amplification, organisation, resolution (Hainsworth & Meng 1988); definition, legitimisation,

polarisation and identification, emphasising the importance of the media role in the final two stages (J.Grunig & Repper (1992:149); potential, emerging, current, crisis, dormant/resolved (Larkin & Regester 1999:38). Hallahan sees issues not as static but evolving "from a period of inception and growth to maturity"(2001:30). Wartik & Heugens believe the issue life cycle models which have been around since the 1970s "today suffer from some serious shortcomings" and lack "descriptive accuracy and theoretical rigour", but argue for them to continue to be perceived as useful tools (2003:13-14). Lamertz, Martens & Heugens present a model of issue evolution that departs from the orthodox 'natural history or life cycle' frameworks and argue that "social issues should be interpreted as socially constructed disruptions of an institutional order that structures purposeful exchanges between actors". They add that issue evolution then "resembles an ongoing sense-giving battle in which actors seek to restore the order by imposing their unique solution preferences on the situation"(2003:82). This analysis would strengthen the view that the progress of an issue through the life cycle stages is not regular or predictable but very much influenced by the impact of relational episodes created by the actors.

The process

Chase and others have drawn up models to explain the issue management process (Bitter 1983; Buchholz 1982; Seitel 1995; Baskin *et al* 1997; Ewing 1987, 1997; Watson *et al* 2002). Chase & Jones developed a model in writings from 1976, described by Chase (1984:36ff) in five steps:

- issue identification

- issue analysis
- issue change strategy options
- issue action programming
- evaluation of results.

Ewing's model (1987, 1997) elaborates Chase/Jones's fifth stage into three parts relating to implementation and communication, review and adjustments, and keeping management and staff focused on the issue until it is resolved. Pavlik sees issue management in three stages: define the function, define the process, manage the process (1987:57).

Later models pay more specific attention to the role of negotiation in the issue management process. Watson, Osborne-Brown and Longhurst, for example, show a five stage negotiation process:

- insight – understanding an organisation's environment, its people and their motivations
- inclusion of all relevant stakeholders
- exploration to understand each other's viewpoints
- seeking common ground through negotiation
- completing a written and agreed plan for progress

These authors stress the importance of "solving issues at their source through effective communications" and not through a strategy of defence (2002: 54-61)

Four stages

Femers *et al* (2000:255) see four main development stages in the issue management process: emergence, dissemination, establishment and erosion and they attribute a strong influence to intermediary groups, especially the media. Their approach has considerable application when the breakdown between the four stages is nearly clearcut. They see alternative, or even combined strategies of encouragement and discouragement in each of the four stages as follows:

- Phase 1 – encouragement of the issue by defining its core and giving it a secure and sound basis; discouragement through being defensive and nipping it in the bud.
- Phase 2 – encouragement in arranging for protagonists to make their appearance and form alliances; discouragement through counter-interpretations of the issues and support given to antagonists.
- Phase 3 – encouragement through symbolic communication and simplification of the issue; discouragement through advocacy communication, refutation or modification of the issue through acceptance.
- Phase 4 – encouragement through a re-launch of the issue and return then to Phases 2 and 3; discouragement through silencing the issue to death, killing it off.

Strategies

Hallahan (2001) sees issue activation as encompassing four key processes (and a series of sub-processes) that take people from a state of inactivity to

activism. These four principal strategies are negotiation (active public), intervention (aroused), education (aware) and prevention (inactive). Hallahan describes the role of protagonists and antagonists in the management of an issue: "The struggle between issue advocates (protagonists) and the targets of their efforts (antagonists) often constitutes a melodrama in which the parties become actors assuming the roles of heroes, victims and villains"(2001:32). Chase sees three change strategies for managing issues: reactive (organisation always opposes change); adaptive (organisation attempts to satisfy the demands of outside groups); and dynamic or pro-active (organisation creates and directs policy rather than merely reacting to policy trends established by other forces (1984:7,58-60). Vercic & J.Grunig hold that most of the literature on issue management conceptualises the process as asymmetrical, i.e. one of anticipating what issues publics and activists will create in the future and then taking positive action to defeat these potential opponents, whereas in symmetrical issue management "public relations managers attempt to communicate with publics before decisions are made so that problems are resolved collaboratively before publics are forced to make issues out of them"(2000:42).

Communication

Whatever the strategy adopted, communication is seen as a cement that holds the issue management process together. Hallahan supports this view that "once people recognise a problem, classic theories suggest that they will engage in communication to address the problem"(2001:38, citing Blumer

1946/1966; Dewey 1927). For Hallahan, problem recognition initially entails simple acknowledgement of consequences, but as people become more exposed to alternative viewpoints, particular attributes of the problem and its relevance become apparent. "People for whom the problem has readily identifiable consequences thus move out of inactivity into a more aroused state (2001:38). The form of the communication is important and, following Grunig's terms, it is more effective when it is two-way and involving dialogue. Seymour & Moore say "it involves education, dialogue, and persuasion rather than promotion, debate or dictation"(2000:160).

The multiplication of mass media outlets and emergence of the internet and other new media has made it more difficult for an organisation to be heard as there are many competing messages for the attention of the same publics. Also the power of the mass media to distort a message has become more widely recognised. Ewing does not believe the media create issues but they play a key role in issue development (1987:40;1997:180). T.Traverse-Healy views the media as drawing attention to issues and helping to form the agenda (1994:18). For Femers *et al*, "the way an issue penetrates society can (to an extent) be defined as a function of media involvement"(2000:256).

Evaluation

The issue management process models advocated in the literature all refer to evaluation but as in other areas of public relations, there is a certain fuzziness, or 'mushiness', when it comes to being specific about how the process can be evaluated (Dozier 1995). For instance, Bentele & Rutsch's

(2001) analysis of issue management in German and American companies asked many questions about the structure, role, tools of issue management but not how results were evaluated although it was implied in some of the tools, or instruments, used. Seymour & Moore recognise the evaluation question, suggesting that "in issues management the path between communicating an issue and securing a company's objectives can wind somewhat confusingly for definitive measurement"(2000:177). In the context of this study, and my preference for Cutlip Center & Broom's definition of public relations, it is important to note Hon & J.Grunig's view (1999:9) that "we should be able to determine the value of public relations by measuring the quality of relationships with strategic publics".

PUBLICS

What is a public?

Certain theorists have suggested that issues create consequences for people through the impact they have upon them. These people then group with others who are similarly affected, thus creating a public which is then in a position to respond to the issue. Grunig & Hunt see a public as a group of people who face a similar problem, recognise the problem exists and organise to do something about it and they sum it up: "Thus consequences create the conditions needed for publics to form. The presence of the publics, in turn, creates a public relations problem for the organisation"(1984:144). Leitch & Neilson believe that the

primary tension within and between the various definitions of publics to be found in widely used public relations textbooks arises between strategic and dialogic approaches. The strategic approaches that dominate the field portray publics as consumers of targeted organisational messages. The dialogic approaches portray publics as active and equal participants in a dialogue with the organisation (2001:128).

Researchers have traced development of this analysis through many authors from Bryce (1888), Park (1904), Lippmann (1922), Dewey (1927), Blumer (1946), Cobb & Elder (1983), Grunig & Hunt (1984), Price (1992), Wilson (1994), Vasquez & Taylor (2001) and others. The reality has still not been adequately explained, in that the role, complexity and the unpredictability of the individual have not yet been integrated into current theories.

Marketing

A marketing-led perspective on public relations can lead to an equation of publics with markets, but the distinction between the two is best made by J.Grunig & Repper: "Organisations can choose their markets, but publics arise on their own and choose the organisation for attention"(1992:128). Vercic, J.Grunig & L.Grunig develop this point and warn that if public relations becomes solely a marketing function, "the organisation loses its ability to build relationships with all of its strategic publics and is limited to communication with consumer publics"(1996:38).

Stakeholders and publics

A distinction between stakeholders and publics has emerged in more recent literature. Grunig & Hunt (1984) did not make it explicitly and it is still not universally recognised. However, Grunig & Repper later defined three stages in the strategic management of public relations – the stakeholder stage, the public stage and the issue stage – thus identifying publics through their relationship in turn with the organisation, the situation and the public relations strategy (1992:124). For Grunig, in Heath (ed. 2005), stakeholders are general categories of people, e.g. employees, community etc., whereas publics arise when organisations make decisions that have consequences on people inside and outside the organisation who were not involved in making that decision (2005:778). Heath (ed. 2005) has separate treatment of publics and stakeholders. Rawlins & Bowen seem to acknowledge the distinction but see it as a very fine one: “Most organisations have a diverse set of publics derived from what an organisation does and whom it affects. Some of these publics require constant and long-range relationships, whereas others exist as temporary and short-term relationships (2005:718). It can be concluded that publics form as groups around an issue and can include some but not necessarily all members of more than one stakeholder group.

Mass perspective

A mass perspective on publics has influenced textbook authors such as Harlow & M.Black (1952), Haywood (1984), Jefkins (1988), Carty (1992), S.Black (1993a), Harrison (1995), Jefkins & Yadin (1998). They give lists of

stakeholder groups, identified as publics, e.g. employees, community, customers, business, politicians, financial, opinion leaders and international (Carty 1992:109-43). It is a very shallow way to plan public relations campaigns by looking solely at these 'permanent' groups and deciding unilaterally which messages to shoot at them, overlooking the complex reality that these groups are not like markets, that they, or individuals from them, can target an organisation when it least desires it and to its ultimate cost. Broom & Dozier criticise the use of these 'static laundry lists' of publics which do not take into account the specific problem situation (1990:32).

HOW PUBLICS BEHAVE

Situational perspective

Much of the research and application of the situational perspective of publics has come from J.Grunig. He developed his situational theory of publics, including an attempt to predict how particular types of publics, especially active publics, will behave in certain circumstances. Grunig's theory, popularly explained in Grunig & Hunt (1984, Ch. 7), has withstood critical analysis but it is still admitted that behaviour cannot be adequately predicted. Grunig drew from Dewey (1927) and Blumer (1946), in particular, to identify three types of public – latent, aware and active. A group that fits none of these types is described by Grunig as a non-public – neither the organisation nor the group have consequences for each other. Grunig's situational theory leads to four kinds of active public – all-issue, apathetic, hot-issue, single-issue.

Variables

Grunig's analysis takes account of three independent variables: problem recognition, constraint recognition and level of involvement. Linked to these are two dependent variables: information seeking and information processing. Grunig earlier referred to a fourth independent variable, a referent criterion, defined as a solution carried from previous situations to a new situation. Thus, the referent criterion reduced the need for a person to seek additional information in the new situation. Bernays would seem to have been alert to the value of the referent criterion saying that "no idea or opinion is an isolated factor. It is surrounded and influenced by precedent, authority, habit and all the other human motivations"(1923:97). However, Grunig discarded the referent criterion from later development of his theory, believing it had little effect on communication behaviour. It was considered more of an effect of communication than a cause, and it was treated as a dependent variable. Grunig says the referent criterion was dropped in favour of two other cognitive and attitudinal variables. "I had defined 'referent criterion' at times to be what now appears to be a 'schema' and at other times to be what now appears to be a 'cross-situational attitude'"(1997:11).

Predicting, changing and explaining behaviour

Grunig's theory has been valuable for enabling practitioners to estimate whether they have a reasonable chance of communicating with each public that arises from the consequences their organisation has on potential members of publics, but it has not been a predictor of behaviour, whether

group or individual. The early research, presented in Grunig & Hunt (1984), showed that the total probability of predicting behaviour in each of the eight behavioural situations arising from combinations of his variables was only 20%, with the highest prediction being 48% for high involvement, problem-facing publics. The Excellence project conducted by J.Grunig et al (1992) shows also that the application of these theories does not necessarily change behaviour with Dozier and Repper saying "the linkage between messages and behaviour is not direct, straightforward, uniformly consistent or powerful" (1992:189). Dozier and Ehling suggest that the "chance of achieving behaviour specified as a programme objective with any particular member of a target public is 0.04 per cent or only four chances in 10,000" (1992:166). The same authors, citing Rice and Atkins (1989) claim that while behavioural effects are relatively difficult to achieve, cognitive effects have been achieved in many communication programmes.

The value of these theories is probably more in their ability to explain behaviour. Grunig, in his recent commentary on situational theory, says it is built from an explanation of "why people communicate and when they are most likely to communicate" and is situational because "problems come and go and are relevant only to people who experience problematic situations related to organisational behaviours". The result is that "publics arise and disappear as situations change, and organisations rarely, if ever, have a permanent set of publics"(2005:778). The limited power of the present situational theory on publics would seem to be a factor in the inability, or unwillingness, of many practitioners to apply it.

Publics as individuals

There has been a tendency through the traditional mass perspective and, now maturing, situational perspective, to identify the composite characteristics of the group – the ‘average’ member – as somehow applying to individuals. There has been a neglect of the central importance and significance of the individual, who, while being essentially a member of the family and of the community, predates the organisation, the public and the issue and comes with the complexity that is unique to their life experience. Both the organisation and its publics are comprised only of individuals who by their human nature are not entirely predictable in their responses or behaviour. Dewey realised the importance of the individual and how this made prediction and planning extremely difficult (1927:158). Going back to the concept of involvement, central to Grunig’s analysis, Coombs says “involvement, an individual’s personal interest in an issue or a topic, is the most widely used interpersonal variable in public relations research”(2001:107). Ideally, but impractically, the perfect public is one single person who is affected by the issue and strategies are then developed specifically for that person. There has to be some grouping, some generalisation, some prioritising, unless the one individual is the decision-maker – politician, official – on whom the entire outcome depends. Oxley says a public, like an organisation, “has no personality of its own (the single exception being a public consisting of one person). It is a community of people each one of whom has a unique personality which cannot be shared”(1989:35). J.Grunig (in conversation, Bled 2002) holds the debatable position that a “public is always a collectivity”, despite the permanent

presence of unpredictable mavericks and emergence in recent years of the single internet blogger who can precipitate a corporate crisis. Aldridge highlights how individuals can change, and have changed, the course of history, for good and for bad, saying they have “brought us a dynamic mixed bag called human civilisation” and that when the great corporations, like General Motors, have sunk into the sands of 5,000 years time, the influence of individuals will remain (2006).

A place for laundry lists?

The ‘laundry-list’ approach to publics finds its way even into situational analyses but these authors seek to refine it. Grunig & Hunt (1984:141) give an even more exhaustive a list of publics (or stakeholders?) than any of the lighter texts but depict four kinds of linkages between organisations and groups of publics:

- enabling – those groups that provide the authority and control the resources that enable an organisation to exist, e.g. stockholders, legislators;
- functional – those that provide inputs e.g. employees and take outputs, e.g. consumers;
- normative – those that face similar problems or share similar values, e.g. associations, and
- diffused – including outside groups which can be clearly identified, or public opinion, e.g. community residents

PUBLICS' INFLUENCE ON DEVELOPMENT OF ISSUES

Compelling response

There is considerable agreement in the literature that publics' responses affect development of issues and compel the organisation to take these responses into account when managing the issue. Hallahan distinguishes between issue activation and issue response, seeing issue activation whenever an individual recognises an inequity and sets about to rectify the problem [issues create publics] and issue response when the activities undertaken by the targets are directed to the organisation [publics influence development of issues] (2001:36).

It seems that there cannot be an absolute prediction of how each individual member of a public will respond to an issue. Lippmann realised many years ago that only in the very simplest cases does an issue "present itself in the same form spontaneously and approximately at the same time to all the members of a public"(1922:230). Hunt and J.Grunig (1994) see life as a constant process of negotiation and compromise with communication as one of the most effective means to do this. Heath says publics must be enjoined in dialogue "based on who they are rather than merely on who the organisations (which are under attack) define them to be"(2001a:7). This reflects the individuality of the publics and of each of their members.

Public opinion

Broom & Dozier point to Arthur W. Page's claim for the over-riding importance of public opinion for the success (or otherwise) of public ventures of all varieties" (1990:xi). There is some support (e.g. Gregory 1996) for the definition of public opinion given by Cutlip *et al* that "it represents a consensus, which emerges over time, from all the expressed views that cluster around an issue in debate, and that this consensus exercises power" (1985:157). Significantly, in their next edition (1994:243) Cutlip *et al* moved from the aggregation theory and saw public opinion "not adequately defined as simply a state of individual cognition" but as reflecting "a dynamic process in which ideas are 'expressed, adjusted, and compromised en route to collective determination of a course of action'" (1994:243, citing Price & Roberts, 1987:784).

Power of public opinion

Perceptions of public opinion vary but there is evidence that power is attributed to it, both when it is believed to be represented through opinion polls and when it is articulated by respected representatives of the community, opinion-leaders. Baskin *et al* (1997:418) point to the effects of negative public opinion and Cutlip *et al* believe public opinion has never been more powerful, fragmented, volatile, exploited and manipulated (1994:242). Gregory (1996:95) sees how public opinion affects management decisions, and Blood takes it as a starting psychological point that "people are not rational, and rarely make decisions in a rational way (that is, using all the appropriate evidence correctly). But we believe that we are rational

and try to rationalise even irrational decisions”(1996:51). One reason why public relations professionals, and all who wish to influence public opinion, pay such attention to media coverage is their belief that such coverage can have an influence. Gregory says “the media do not determine what people think, however, they do provide a platform for discussing issues and they can reinforce the ‘public’ view if a particular issue catches the imagination”(1996:96).

RELATIONSHIPS

The concept of relationship is so familiar, across many disciplines, that it is often assumed to be self-explanatory. Gummesson says “current theory development and practice advocate that relationships are basic to business. History shows that relationships have existed as pillars of business since time immemorial” (1994:258). Broom, Casey & Ritchey found public relations literature “replete with references to relationships that neither define the concept nor indicate how to measure them” but pointed to other disciplinary fields which also use the term and share “similar explication problems with public relations”(2000:4). The current emphasis on relationships in public relations is traced to Ferguson (1984), followed by others such as Broom, Ledingham, Bruning, J. & L.Grunig, Wilson, Varey and Heath.

For Ledingham & Bruning , a relationship is “the state which exists between an organisation and its key publics in which the actions of either entity

impact on the economic, social, political and or cultural well-being of the other entity”(1998:62). For Broom, Casey & Ritchey, the formation of relationships occurs when parties have “perceptions or expectations of each other”, or one or both parties need resources from the other, or perceive “mutual threats from an uncertain environment”, or when there is either “a legal or voluntary necessity to associate”(2000:17). Thomlison defines a relationship as “a set of expectations two parties have for each other’s behaviour based on their interaction patterns”(2000:178).

Distinctions

The most usual distinction is between private and public relationships although the difference seems to be more apparent than real. Wilson (1996) and other writers on the communitarian approach to relationships emphasise the human, personal element. Greenhalgh believes the most important relationships to manage are those between people, because “even relationships between organisations are experienced and dealt with at the interpersonal level...”(2001:259). Ledingham supports the view that “organisation-public relationships mimic interpersonal relationships in terms of critical determinators of relationship quality”, in other words the indicators, characteristics, or dimensions (2005:741). Some other distinctions between relationships are reputational and behavioural (J.Grunig, 2001b:14), expressive and functional (Varey 1998:121, following Parsons, 1951) and constructive and destructive (Toth & Heath 1992:xiii). Bruning & Ledingham (1999) see three types of relationships between organisations and key publics: professional, personal and community.

RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

Central management role

Recent literature stresses that relationship management is not marginal or optional but central to the management of an organisation. For Greenhalgh, "being effective as a manager requires you to be good at managing relationships – relationships with peers, workers, bosses, suppliers, customers, regulators, competitors, and various stakeholders"(2001:ix). He adds that managers don't establish, maintain and manage relationships "just to be nice. They do it because the strategic success of the business depends on it"(2001:10). Greenhalgh considers the effective manager to be a manager of relationships, replacing the old approach that gave primary attention to planning, organisation, directing, and controlling (2001:122).

Communication in relationships

Research in Europe reveals a tendency to treat communication and relationships as identical and interchangeable terms (van Ruler & Vercic 2002). Varey distinguishes between "giving information *to*, while communicating *with*, others"(1998:125). For Broom, Casey & Ritchey, "it would be difficult to overstate the importance of the communication linkage in organisation-public relationships"(2000:16). Daymon emphasises the importance of culture in this communication and feels that disregarding the effects of culture may be why "communications strategies often lead to misunderstandings and even resistance in the workplace"(2000a:241). Ledingham stresses the importance of communication in the relationship

management process but holds it has to be combined with behavioural initiatives (2003:194).

Interpersonal base

Much can be learnt from interpersonal communication theory and public relations theorists and practitioners "have just begun to mine" this valuable resource, according to Coombs. He sees the early dependence on mass communication theory to be "too limiting as relationships become a dominant focus in public relations thinking and practice"(2001:114).

Community base

The concept of community is basic to the view of public relations as relationship management. For Ledingham & Bruning, "the community is a key public for organisations that practise strategic public relations" and managing the organisation-community relationship for the benefit of both the organisation and the community is the basis of modern community relations (2001:527). Starck & Kruckeberg have revisited this idea on several occasions, believing "corporations must recognise that the greatest stakeholder – the ultimate environmental constituency – is society itself, to which such corporations are ultimately and irrefutably answerable"(2001:59). Heath holds "no term is more important to understanding relationships than is *community*"(2001a:3).

A cyclical process

Just as issue management can be described as a cyclical process, so can the origin, development, maintenance and eventual decline and break-up of a relationship be depicted. Broom, Casey & Ritchey (1997, 2000) traced it through antecedents (components of relationships), concepts (properties of relationships), consequences (relationship outcomes) and back to antecedents. J.Grunig & Huang (2000:23-53) and Bruning & Ledingham (2000:159-173) expanded the Broom Casey Ritchey model to identify the stages and forms of relationships through situational antecedents, maintenance strategies and relationship outcomes. An important step in understanding relationships is to identify and define the phases of a relationship. Coombs (2001) notes that these and other treatments of the phases of the organisation-stakeholder relationship development provide a method for evaluating its status. Noting that relationship models generally view relationships as developing systematically and incrementally, Thomlison says it should be remembered that "the process is seldom as simple or the transitions to other stages as quick as represented"(2000:188). He suggests a model which defines the stages through which the relationship moves, remembering, however, that it is a fluid process, with interpenetration and interaction between the stages, moving at unpredictable rates and influenced by relational episodes that have impact on the relationship. It was decided, for this study, to take the Broom Casey Ritchey model, as developed by Grunig & Huang, Bruning & Ledingham and others, but noting other treatments outlined by Thomlison, to arrive at

these stages: antecedents/expectations; indicators, cultivation strategies and outcomes.

ANTECEDENTS AND EXPECTATIONS

Broom, Casey & Ritchey see antecedents as the different influencing factors which bring participants together in a relationship (2000:16). Daymon draws attention to the cultural element in antecedents (2000a:243), as does Kovacs who sees culture as "a variable of significance to public relations researchers, particularly since it bears on the way in which relationships are formed and maintained"(2001:422). Following social exchange theory that social relationships involve the exchange of resources, the idea of costs and benefits arises in a relationship and Ledingham & Bruning show how it can affect expectations with each partner having a standard or an expectation of the other:

When a partner meets or exceeds that standard of comparison level, satisfaction with the relationship occurs. When the standard or expectation is not met, dissatisfaction occurs. Moreover, partners continually weigh the rewards and costs of the relationship (2001:530).

Thomlison follows this line when he says "meeting or exceeding a relational partner's expectations for the relationship becomes vital to that relationship's quality and longevity"(2000:185). One might interpret the above in simple terms that antecedents are the 'baggage' that each party brings to the relationship, linked with the referent criterion idea that Grunig

originally included in his situational theory of publics. This 'baggage' creates expectations which cannot always be fulfilled because of a clash between the baggage carried by each party. It takes time for each to realise the other's baggage; sometimes it is never realised. Coombs & Holladay find that a favourable relationship history becomes a bank account of good will and "once a positive view of a person or organisation is established people will ignore information that contradicts the favourable reputation"(2001:324). This angle is also raised by other writers, including Thomlison (2000:194) and Watson & Noble (2005:14). It has direct relevance to a case like John Charles McQuaid who held office as Archbishop for more than 30 years and was known to many, but only by some, while all had a perception of his reputation, good or bad, built up over those years.

RELATIONSHIP INDICATORS

The term indicator is adopted here for what the literature on relationship management also calls dimensions, characteristics, concepts or properties of a relationship. There is considerable agreement that indicators are a means of identifying the status of the relationship and that outcomes can be assessed through perceived changes in their strength. The maintenance, or cultivation, strategies will in most cases be the independent variables and each of the indicators will be dependent variables. This literature review has identified 106 indicators of relationships and showed how different writers have reduced them to a lower number, which seem essentially to cover the others.

Examples

- Ledingham & Bruning (1998): trust, openness, involvement, investment (time and effort) and commitment (decision to stay in the relationship);
- Hutton (1999): effective communication, mutual adaptation, mutual dependency, shared values, trust, commitment;
- Hon & J.Grunig (1999): control mutuality, trust (involving integrity, dependability and competence), satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationship, communal relationship;
- Huang (1997, 2001): control mutuality, trust, relational satisfaction and relational commitment.
- The Golin/Harris international consultancy (*Frontline* 2001): trust (leading to integrity), competence, affinity, commitment, leadership and reinforcement.

Comment

The Hon and Grunig model (1999) has gained wide acceptance and will be referred to again in discussion on assessing change in relationships. However, the nature of this study and the data emerging from it calls for more direct reference to indicators such as complexity and time. Of the authors covered in this review it seems that only Broom, Casey & Ritchey (2000), have explicitly presented complexity as a relationship indicator. There would seem to be acceptance that time is an indicator because relationships mature and change over time, as depicted in Knapp and Vangelisti's staircase model (1996, cited Thomlison 2000:189). For Coombs, "there must be a *long-lasting* connection involving *mutual exchanges* between

parties. Meeting someone once is not a relationship, nor is only one party sending messages to another party”(2001:106).

Appendix B (p. 541) lists the 106 relationship indicators identified in this literature review, followed by dictionary definitions and a reduction of them to nine broad indicators:

- Trust
- Commitment
- Communalility
- Communication
- Complexity
- Control
- Satisfaction
- Shared values
- Time

TRUST AS A FUNDAMENTAL INDICATOR

Trust, repeatedly mentioned as the most fundamental and common relationship indicator, is constant throughout the literature from several disciplines, including sociology and philosophy as well as public relations. Wright regards trust and credibility as one of the greatest challenges facing organisations in every corner of the world and believes “trust is the major basis for public approval and that such approval is necessary in order for companies to succeed”(2004). Center & Jackson emphasise the need for

mutual trust in all human communities (1995:81); J.T.Wood (1995) sees trust as the feeling that those in the relationship can rely on each other, with dependability, forthrightness and trustworthiness as key components; Hon & J.Grunig describe it as "one party's level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party" and see three indicators in trust – integrity, dependability and competence (1999:3). Wilson holds an "attitude of trust expressed behaviourally as loyalty must be one of the primary goals in relationship building with organisational publics"(2000:138). Grunig & Huang stress its importance at all levels (2000:29); Bohan warns it cannot be taken for granted and once broken "is not easily reclaimed"(2001:16); Greenhalgh also points to its fragility (2001:28). Vidal describes the long and expensive libel action that fast food company McDonalds took against two penniless activists. McDonalds' reason for enduring several years of bad publicity was given by their Chief of Communications: "We believe that we have a trust placed in us. A lot of people trust McDonalds. The allegations challenge that trust and if we don't stand up then it would be seen that there is some truth in the allegations"(1997:16).

A hierarchy in trust

Bibb & Kourdi (2004:5) give an ascending set of classifications for trust:

- faith (a religious belief – trust in a deity);
- predictability (my dog will not bite me);
- dependability (my car will start);
- elementary trust (the doctor is qualified);
- advanced trust (my partner will remain faithful to me).

This classification positions religious faith as the lowest, but fundamental and original form of trust. For Misztal, "to trust is to believe despite uncertainty. Trust always involves an element of risk..."(1996:18).

Depicting trust

For O'Hara, "trust is a multifarious phenomenon, the by-product of many interactions, cultural effects and institutional practices. We cannot quantify it except crudely; we do not understand it, except via many different and inconsistent theories"(2004:284). Vercic describes trust as a "hypothetical construct. As such, it is not directly observable"(2003:8). Mai & Akerson see it as "a condition of commitment and the glue that binds members of a community. In organisations, it is based on expectations, as well as demonstrations, of leaders being open, honest and fair"(2003:22). For Vercic it

serves as a lubricant that smoothes transactions and is therefore a cost-saving device. As we can monetarise transaction costs, so we can monetarise savings we get from applying trust – instead of personally investing in monitoring and control. Trust thus becomes a commodity itself and we can draw its utility function: trust and transaction costs are inversely related (2005:866).

People we trust

Bibb & Kourdi notice a "robustness about authentic people. We may not always like their honesty but we know we can trust them to be honest and not to play games"(2004:56). They also believe that "moral courage – the courage of our convictions – is present in those people that we choose to

trust”(2004:144). For O’Hara, trust is often based on one’s own personal experience. We use knowledge to inform our trust, to decide who and what is trustworthy, and that knowledge can be gleaned locally (2004:75). O’Neill notices that “we still constantly place trust in many of the institutions and professions we profess not to trust”(2002:13).

Trust and profitability

Bibb & Kourdi asked more than a hundred people in Europe and North America if trust was important for increasing profitability, and the majority response was “no”(2004:34), but nearly all of the business people to whom they spoke, “believed there was a link between a culture of trust and business success, including profitability, but proving it was another matter”(2004:75). Vercic (2003) reported on his research of trend values in three British companies British Airways, Shell and the Post Office between the early 1970s and late 1990s. He investigated trends in their media exposure, media favourability, awareness and performance results through time and compared them with trends identified in their trust results for the same period. He found that trends in media exposure, awareness and performance were unrelated to trends in trust and there was virtually no trend in media favourability. This finding went against common views that trust plays a key part in all of these other trend values. Golin (2004), however, believes that “the positive connection between trust and results reveals itself over time – it’s not a short-term revelation”.

When trust is absent or lost

Bibb & Kourdi believe that "when trust is absent, risk tends to be seen as negative, something to be avoided, assiduously managed, minimised or removed altogether. In such an atmosphere, it is invariably discussed with a wary sense of concern, even alarm"(2004:22). They found that low-trust cultures are characterised by fear of the loss, fear of making a mistake because of the repercussions and fear of losing one's job"(2004:124). O'Neill (2002:3) cites Waley (1938:xii:7,164) on how

Confucius told his disciple Tzu-kung that three things are needed for government: weapons, food and trust. If a ruler can't hold on to all three, he should give up the weapons first and the food next. Trust should be guarded to the end: without trust we cannot stand.

Balancing trust and control

Handy, referring to the 'spiral of distrust' and the principle of balance that keeps cropping up in life, sees a "reciprocal 'balancing' relationship between trust and control, so that when trust is increased control diminishes, and if you increase your control the perceived trust is decreased, as on a balance"(1978:98).

CULTIVATION STRATEGIES

The next element in the cyclical relationship management process, following antecedents, expectations and indicators, is cultivation, or maintenance strategies. A useful platform for description of cultivation strategies and

debate around them is the statement by Hon & J.Grunig that the goal in managing the relationship is inevitably to push each characteristic in the 'right' direction. They list some process indicators for these strategies: access, positivity, openness, assurances, networking and sharing of tasks. Then, within the context of the Excellence Study, they combine strategies that deal with conflict resolution into three categories:

- Integrative – symmetrical, win-win solutions;
- Distributive – asymmetrical, win-lose solutions;
- Dual concern – mixed motive solutions, collaborative advocacy.

They divide dual concern strategies into both asymmetrical and symmetrical solutions: contending, avoiding, accommodating and compromising, being asymmetrical; co-operating, being unconditionally constructive and saying win-win or no deal, being symmetrical (1999:13-18).

Strategies critique

Literature, on balance, seems to support Hon & Grunig's listing as a fair and accurate overview of the research but has also noted areas which need clarification or expansion. It is interesting that general business writers, such as Greenhalgh and Handy, who claim no brief for public relations, support the collaborative, symmetrical approach rather than the traditional hierarchical view of management. It would seem the principles of private relationships are filtering through to public relationships – the approach is becoming more human.

Symmetrical or asymmetrical

J.Grunig & Huang (2000:27) maintain that “we can build relationships more effectively if we build symmetrical ones, which benefit both organisations and publics, than if we build asymmetrical ones that benefit only the organisation”. There are those, however, who criticise a tendency to make undue claims for symmetrical strategies and point even to their impracticality, saying there are instances where symmetry is a fiction even if the strategy gives the appearance of symmetry. Leitch & Neilson, for instance, say it is “simply absurd to suggest that an interaction between, for example, a transnational corporation and a public consisting of unskilled workers in a developing country can be symmetrical just because the interaction is symmetrical in form”(2001:129). O’Hara refers to vertical relations which change the properties and requirements of trust: “If I am in a vertical relation, at the bottom end, I have ceded control of all my actions. I allow (legitimate) authorities to circumscribe my freedom”(2004:92). He introduces the concept of deference towards “an authority, a vicar, a doctor or a politician”. Another example is the hierarchical relationship in the Catholic Church between a bishop and his ‘flock’ no matter how wide-ranging the consultation structures.

Criticism of the impracticality of certain proposed strategies is based on the fact that players in relationships are always human, and only human, and they suffer the limitations of humankind. The Excellence Study refers to ‘seat-of-the-pants’ management (J.Grunig: 1992:162, 337).

Embracing or avoiding conflict

Some see conflict as inevitable in relationships, and always to be avoided if possible. Greenhalgh does not necessarily see strains in relationships as a problem if they are managed well (2001:12). He holds that apologising is "the simplest of techniques" and the "single most important thing you can do to begin healing a damaged relationship". He warns against arguing because that shifts the focus from "healing the relationship to winning the argument" (2001:51-2). For Bridges & Nelson, publics who have been part of positive, continuing relationships that were developed before a conflict "will be more willing to understand the organisation's position, and to negotiate to a win-win-solution" (2000:112).

Power and exclusion

Greenhalgh does not favour the use of power in a relationship, holding that "managers should avoid using power whenever possible" because "power use emphasises domination and submission. It fosters resentment and avoidance" (2001:238-9). Leichty & Warner believe that "of all the curses that inhabit the world, the desire for certainty probably is the worst. In the end, public relations should be about wooing, not dominating" (2001:74). Gaffney gives a psychologist's viewpoint and sees a danger in being over-responsive to others, suggesting that "endlessly responding can result in avoidance of necessary conflict and therefore in confusion about where responsibility lies" (2001:72).

Negotiation

From the above, negotiation might seem to involve necessary compromise but would that make it, according to Hon & Grunig, a less excellent strategy, or should the term adaptation be used instead of compromise? J.Grunig claims benefits for negotiation, that "when issues or potential crises are discussed and negotiated with publics, the result is to improve relationships with publics"(2001b:13). Coombs favours argument within the negotiation process: "A willingness and an ability to engage in argument (argumentativeness) facilitates the negotiation process" and can also facilitate the exchange of ideas central to dialogue (2001:113).

RELATIONSHIPS AS OUTCOMES

The desired outcome in public relations practice is not publicity, nor counting press cuttings, but, as Center & Jackson say, it is "public relationships"(1995:2). Kovacs is another who supports this view that "relationships are intrinsically worthwhile outcomes"(2001:423). In relationship management the same terms are used when talking about indicators and outcomes (Hon & Grunig, 1999), and while this might lead to confusion at first sight, it is supported by Ledingham & Bruning, who, for example, say that "models of the organisation-public relationship should include relationship dimensions as both building blocks of organisation-public relationship and as indicators of relationship quality"(2000:66). The use of the term 'consequences' alongside 'outcomes' probably helps to emphasise that there are outcomes both external and internal to relationships, as when Broom, Casey & Ritchey say: "The consequences of

relationships are the outputs that have the effects of changing the environment and of maintaining, or changing goal states both inside and outside the organisation"(2000:16). Bruning believes effectively managed organisation-public relationships affect key public member attitudes, evaluations and behaviours (2002:39), and, also, that conclusions in this regard "have been based on asking recipients to indicate their behavioural intent rather than tracking the actual behaviour of respondents"(2002:42).

Change

It would seem that relationships necessarily change when the indicators change, because if one or both partners resists change in indicators, which themselves are dynamic and moving to and fro along a continuum as the relationship develops or declines, the relationship is by that fact changed. When a relationship hits a rock, one or both partners, in their own or each other's interests, or a wider common interest, might decide not to submit to the negative consequences, but that resistance itself puts another marker on the relationship which can be ignored but not erased. Broom, Casey & Ritchey see relationships themselves as both the consequences of change and the cause of further change, in other words as both dependent and independent variables (2000:16). Varey states that relationships are seldom static, as even a period of quietude or dormancy has a deepening and a maturing or dissolving effect (1998:120).

Relational episodes, crisis and change

Events inside and/or outside the relationship are frequently referred to as relational episodes. The change in a relationship created by a relational episode is most obvious during and after a crisis. Relationships with potentially all of the organisation's stakeholders are affected for better or worse by the manner in which the crisis is handled. Obviously, as in a crisis, relationships will be affected by the manner in which a dispute is handled. The effect of such a dispute might be short-lived and relationships might soon return to semblances of their original state, but they will still be changed by the memory of the dispute. The crisis itself then becomes an antecedent and can shape future expectations in the relationship process. Coombs & Holladay say "one facet of a crisis is that it can damage or be a threat to a quality relationship", and that good maintenance strategies will not prevent all crises but can diminish the damage done to relationships (2001:324-5).

Recognition of episodal impact

Recognising the impact of relational episodes upon relationships indicates the problem in evaluating public relations activity. Dozier refers to 'mushy' consequences and applies it in particular to excellent organisations where there is good management. Dozier takes 'mushy' to mean "that the outcome may be quantifiable (e.g. stock prices), but excellent communication can claim only partial (and non-quantifiable) credit for that outcome. By mushy, we also mean that some outcomes have no direct monetary value, but they are highly valued nevertheless"(1995:218). It might be easier to attribute

cause and effect when a public deliberately creates an episode and targets an organisation or vice versa, or might it be just a coincidence and really the result of some other episode? Gummesson refers to a "chicken and egg connection between relationship marketing and the network corporation: the direction of causality is not evident"(1994:254). Coombs states that a matter of particular concern to practitioners is "how specific interventions can be used to alter the relationship in a desired fashion" He also points to another concept which further confuses any analysis of the cause and effect, specifically "the fact that organisations have to manage multiple relationships simultaneously"(2001:114).

Public relations field dynamics

Springston & Keyton introduced the concept of public relations field dynamics (PRFD), an approach which takes into account the fact that every act of behaviour takes place in a larger context that is part of an interactive field. Its implication is that any strategy directed to one public must be selected while keeping in mind the potential impact on other publics in the field (2001:117). Springston says PRFD tries to measure how much power or influence an actor is perceived to have in a given situation and how knowledge of this can help an organisation determine which groups will be most attentive and involved in a public relations situation. He says that at the centre of PRFD is "the notion of a fluid field encompassing all relevant actors. These actors can be measured at one point in time or across the development of a controversial issue"(2005:691). The perceived relational landscape attempts to track the importance of each actor across three axes:

low influence/high influence; community oriented/self-oriented; unfriendly/friendly. The same suggestion, that a single issue and a single relationship cannot be considered in isolation, but that they interact in a complex environment, is also discussed by Carty (2003–Appendix E, p. 584).

Little things

Broom & Dozier say the impact of episodes upon relationships is constantly assumed but rarely proved: "In practice, impact measures are made on one or both sides of relationships and then inferences made – sometimes explicitly, usually implicitly – about how the relationships changed"(1990:82). Gladwell observed that we are trained to think that what goes into any transaction or relationship or system must be directly related, in intensity and dimension, to what comes out. He believes, however, that we have to abandon this expectation and to prepare ourselves for the possibility that sometimes big changes follow from small events, and that sometimes these changes can happen very quickly (2000:11).

Peaceful and turbulent environments

If all were simple, the connection between episodes and relationship change would also be simple, but there is much noise around us, and there are senders of multiple messages seeking our attention. Handy writes that in turbulent times "we look for certainty and sure authority. We want to be followers, not leaders, even in a small way. We want 'them' to solve our dilemmas, and give us back a quiet life"(1994:93). It could be said that in peaceful times there is less need for managing relationships, they can be

dormant, but when turbulence and change take over the relationship actors become more active and more responsive to one another.

Chaos and complexity

The perspectives of chaos and complexity theories recur in the margins of this review on issue and relationship management, holding that these processes do not proceed in linear, predictable fashion as some theorists would suggest. Life is complex, relationships are complex, there are many forces operating at the same time. Battram sees complexity as the “constant tension between order and chaos”, between two, co-existing urges, the autopoietic urge to “maintain identity, to constantly re-create the self, to resist change, and to focus inwards”, and the vital urge to “change, to grow, to explore the limit, and to focus outwards”(1998:143-4). It is sufficient here to make this point and suggest that all, both conservatives and liberals, upon whom the Vatican Council had an impact, experienced both of these urges in constant tension and none of them were absolutely conservative nor absolutely liberal.

McKie acknowledges the complexity of existing public relations interactions and attempts to look beyond the “simplicity of two-way symmetrical models toward the consideration of complex force fields of multiple competing powers in the real world”(2001:84) Later, he sees chaos theory in non-experimental science disciplines as simply the “structures and regularities underpinning irregular systems or behaviours” and he finds public relations featuring “many examples of perceptions of an organisation

altering, and crises arising, with dramatic suddenness through seemingly insignificant events”(2005:120). He looks back to Lorenz (1993) who posed the now-famous question: “Does the flap of a butterfly’s wings in Brazil set off a tornado in Texas?” and finds that “the so-called butterfly effect influenced the study of dramatic change arising out of tiny variations”(2005:120). McKie then holds that chaos theory was extended by complexity theory, defined by Coveney & Highfield (1995:7) as “the collective behaviour of many basic but interacting units...that are endowed with the potential to evolve in time”(1995:7). One colloquial observation is that chaos is one damn thing after another, but complexity is every damn thing at the same time. This can show two views of a very hot issue which seems to be exploding in every direction at the same time with many publics interacting with it in different ways.

Quantitative evaluation of relationships

It has not been feasible here to go into quantitative evaluation of relationship outcomes and changes, as such measures could not be used in assessing the qualitative data that has been collected in this research project. Hon & J.Grunig are among those who have done significant work in recent years on models for such evaluation and the present state of research is described, with popular confusions and myths untangled, in Watson & Noble (2005). However, it is interesting that Hon & Grunig (1999) seem to focus exclusively on the participants in the relationship and do not seem to take in the spectator perspective – at least the informed and knowledgeable spectator which has been a feature of this study. Broom, Casey & Ritchey

are aware of both perspectives, holding that “relationships have unique and measurable properties that are not shared with the participants in the relationships and that define relationships as being something separate from the participants” (2000:17).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has reviewed theoretical topics, within the public relations field, which are relevant to examination of how Archbishop McQuaid managed the issue of the Second Vatican Council and whether this influenced the public relationships between archbishop, diocesan priests and laity.

Public relations was defined at the outset with emphasis on the role of relationships and reputational capital in the planning and implementation of public relations programmes. Theories of management and strategy were outlined with attention to faith, authority, power and obedience as strong influences within the religious context. This gave a background for understanding the authoritarian approach to management which was still predominant in the 1960s, exercised typically by Archbishop McQuaid and accepted by society.

Issues and issue management were seen as emerging in their modern meaning from the work of Chase and others in the 1970s, with the added importance of negotiation within the management process as expressed by

later authors. Communication was seen as a cement holding the issue management process together. Again, the close linkage between issue and reputation management was observed. The issue life cycle through its four stages of emergence, dissemination, establishment and erosion, was depicted as a suitable frame for consideration of the Vatican Council issue.

The importance of determining the value of public relations by measuring the quality of relationships with strategic publics was highlighted. The term "publics", as used in public relations literature, was developed with consideration of theories, especially, from the situational perspective of J. Grunig, of how publics behave and the difficulty in predicting, or even changing, behaviour through public relations programmes.

The final section of the chapter dealt with relationships and the relationship management process through consideration of antecedents and expectations to indicators, cultivation strategies and then evaluation of relational outcomes viewed as shifts in the indicators. Again, communication was judged to have a vital role in the process. The emphasis in recent literature on trust as a fundamental indicator in a relationship was developed, as this is also a powerful indicator in the religious context where trust begins with the fundamental faith shared by archbishop, clergy and people. Relational episodes, and recognition of their impact on a relationship, was seen to be important, as was recent work on public relations field dynamics.

3: METHODOLOGY

THIS CHAPTER builds the platform for presentation of, and discussion on the findings about how McQuaid handled the Vatican Council issue, along with other issues and influences that impinged upon it and upon his relationships with priests and laity. It is the link between the academic principles and processes, outlined in the literature review, and the subsequent chapters which consider their application and relevance to the data found in the research.

The theories may be fine, and the field research excellent and the archives fascinating, but what is important is not so much what is discovered but how it is discovered. It is particularly so in a project like this where there are many interviews, many archival documents which are interesting, but not always connected, and a myriad of diversions into secondary sources, sometimes based on hearsay and rumour. How strong is the evidence to support the conclusions in the final chapter? It has been important, therefore, to give a transparent and detailed account of the research process and steps taken to enhance reliability and validity and reduce bias on the part of the interviewer or interviewee.

I have preferred to write in the first person, as I was an instrument in the research process and brought to it my own views, values and experience. I was also a participant in the phenomenon studied and I was interviewing

other participants who had, however, played more central roles in that phenomenon.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DESCRIPTION

The thesis has been structured in a straight, linear fashion because that seemed most appropriate for the detailed data, both from interviews and archives, which, for the greater part, fell into a chronological sequence. The thread of thought, explicit from the research statement, aims and objectives, has been maintained: McQuaid, Vatican II, priests and laity, relationship changes between 1959 and 1972 and possible reasons for these changes.



Classification of data

|

Presentation of findings

|

Discussion of findings within context of theoretical concepts

|

Conclusions and recommendations

INTERVIEWS

For the optimum number of interviews, I looked to factor analysis, as commonly drawn from quantitative theory. Following factor analysis, Stacks considers that, for certainty that "an underlying dimensionality has been adequately tested, you should try to have at least a 10:1 ratio of respondents to items". He accepts that many factor analyses are run on a fewer number, but suggests it is best "to never drop below a 6:1 respondent-to-item ratio" (2002:234).

The theory behind this is that for reliable pattern-forming to emerge, the patterns should be clear after six properly chosen respondents, and they are not liable to change beyond ten respondents. This study involved three sets of relationships and a fourth 'dimensionality' for McQuaid's handling of the Vatican II issue. This would suggest taking between 24 and 40 witnesses for interview. Following this approach and others such as Kuzel (1992, cited Moloney 1994:57), I settled for a minimum of 36 and finished with 41.

Almost all of them were involved in two of the three sets of relationships giving: McQuaid/priests, 17 participants and 22 observers; McQuaid/laity, 17 participants and 23 observers; priests/laity, 32 participants and 9 observers. There were 41 witness interviews, of which 36 were substantial, covering most, or all, of the topics under examination.

Methods of selection

Interviewees were chosen by a combination of purposive and snowball techniques. From my own experience of the 1960s, I was aware of many who might be suitable for interview. Then, as the interviews progressed and I asked people to suggest others, more names emerged. Several priests suggested others who had special experiences from the 1960s and were in sufficiently good health, with memories intact, to give reliable evidence. They allowed me to use their names as reference.

It would not have been feasible, nor have added to the reliability of the exercise, to interview people from each of McQuaid's relational perspectives, as the numbers would have been prohibitive. The selection was sufficiently representative of the totality of perspectives and relationships to allow patterns to be observed.

Fear of refusal

The first few interviews were with lay journalists, but some priests' initially slow response to my letters led to anxiety at end of 2002 that they might not co-operate, that they might confer together and say nothing. The reason for

this anxiety was fresh revelations of child sex abuse by priests, particularly in the Dublin archdiocese. As it turned out, all of the priests whom I interviewed were open, trusting, and sympathetic to the research.

Requesting interviews

Requests for interview were normally made by letter. I did not follow up unanswered requests, but continued selection until there was a satisfactory balance of both priests and laity and of perspectives. At the end, two important, unanswered letters were followed up and interviews were granted.

Appendix C (p. 552) contains:

- Sample request letter for interview;
- Names and details of interviewees
- Those who were approached for interview but declined;
- Those who did not reply to request for interview.

Interview protocols

I evolved a general interview protocol but adapted it to interviewees' background and experience. The sequence of themes and questioning did not necessarily follow that laid down.

Appendix C (p. 552) contains:

- General interview protocol

- Example of protocol for one early interview (28/2/03) and one later interview (19/11/03).

Ethics

Each interviewee was informed of the purpose of the research. Confidentiality was assured and commitment given that the full transcript of their interview would be sent for approval and amendment, and that, again, before submission of the thesis, all quotations would be submitted for renewed clearance. They were also told that the transcripts would not be shown to others without their permission. My request for the interviewee's name to be disclosed was declined in only four cases and these are referred to as Fathers A, B, C and D. I have not told any third party that I interviewed these four priests. Permission was also sought for use of a tape recorder and it was refused in only one case, Fr. Corish, while I chose in two other cases not to use the tape recorder because I felt the interviewee might feel uneasy with it, Fr. Hurley and Fr. Lehane. Two tape recorders were used as a precaution against mechanical failure. Telephone interviews were not taped. I have respected all of the above commitments.

The interviews were held at the interviewees' residences or places of work, except for Rice (hotel), and Brophy and Father C (my residence). Interviews ranged in duration from 40 to 210 minutes. The average was 95 minutes.

Conduct of interviews

An easy, informal rapport was achieved in all interviews. I was conscious that I had known several of the interviewees over a period of nearly forty years and, also, that I had first-hand knowledge of the phenomenon being studied. In the earlier interviews, I tended to take a stand-off approach, effectively seeming to be less familiar with the events and therefore waiting for the interviewees to raise highlights. It soon became clear that the same highlights were prominent in the memories of most of the interviewees, e.g. "No change" address by McQuaid at the end of the Council, "Empty Chair" meeting at the Mansion House and publication of the *Humanae Vitae* encyclical on birth control. For subsequent interviews I was more active in the discussion as this helped to elicit further recollections. As I had my protocol clear, I allowed the interviewees to talk, often at length, about matters which sometimes seemed less relevant to the study, but I was aware that they were elderly people and would sometimes come to a point by talking around it for a while. Therefore, I let their train of thought flow, always ensuring that the most relevant items in the protocol were covered. In many cases this approach bore fruit as the free flow of memory allowed interesting and relevant insights to surface in a way that might not have happened if I had been more formal. So, the interviews were semi-structured but in parts unstructured. I was conscious that I was gaining insights into a social history, so I let it flow. While, to some extent, I shared my own memories and probably spoke too much sometimes – as realised when I played back the tapes – I was careful not to declare my personal stance on debated issues, and not to agree or disagree with their positions.

Some interviewees gave me relevant back-up material. These included books and articles they had written or contributed to in the 1960s or since, in which they had put on record some of the views that they had confirmed to me.

After interview

Within 24 hours after each interview, I wrote, without reference to tape or notes, a set of impression notes on what seemed to have been highlights of the interview. I wrote then to thank each interviewee and promise that the transcript would be sent on to them. As it took a lot of time to transcribe what came to 350,000 words of transcript, there was often a few months gap between interview and transcript. In seeking verification and approval of the transcripts, I said I would assume approval if there was not a reply. Some made pertinent amendments and additions, or asked for certain statements to be anonymous. Mgr. Moloney and Cardinal Connell invited me for a second interview which added value to the original material. Some requested that I edit the structure of their sentences where I felt this was needed. The final quotations were sent to each interviewee in December 2005. Accuracy was confirmed and permission renewed for them to be used.

ARCHIVES

In 1998 the Archbishop of Dublin, Desmond Connell, opened the McQuaid section of the Dublin Diocesan Archives for researchers. The entire McQuaid

papers amount to 700 boxes, but release is on a phased basis over the years to 2009. These were my principal archival source. The National Archives of Ireland revealed correspondence of the Irish Ambassador to the Holy See about Vatican II, the Irish bishops and the Irish Government. The official Vatican publications of the pre-Council submissions and addresses by McQuaid to the Council were examined in the Pope John Paul II Library, Maynooth. Newspapers, books, journals and other documents were studied mainly in the National Library of Ireland, the Central Catholic Library, the James Joyce Library at UCD, Dublin Institute of Technology Library, Aungier Street, and my own private archives.

Help from archivist

David Sheehy, the Dublin diocesan archivist, was extremely co-operative and knowledgeable. He was always on hand to search and to deal with queries and gaps. He suggested promising areas that might have been underestimated, such as correspondence with other bishops going back to 1940, the Knights of St. Columbanus and the Legion of Mary, and, while I was there, he was sorting the papers on the Dublin Diocesan Press Office, which I then found very helpful. At the start of my search, he told me that the papers on Vatican II would not be released for some years. However, in summer 2004, he brought in another archivist to assist in sorting and cataloguing the Vatican II papers, and, as that work was done, each box was passed on to me. There were some interesting items, but a lot was documentation from the Holy See, usually in Latin. Where relevant, this was translated. Portions of McQuaid's UCD correspondence, which is not due

for release, in its entirety, until 2009, were made available, in particular, letters with the two presidents of the period, Michael Tierney and Jeremiah Hogan. The released papers do not cover personnel files and others which could still be sensitive for living people, especially priests. For example, the papers on the Vigilance ("V") Committee which were shown to John Bowman for his two RTE television documentaries in 1998, are not now available.

DISCUSSION ON METHODS

Quantitative or qualitative

A qualitative paradigm was chosen in preference to quantitative, because the aims of the research pointed to in-depth understanding and a holistic view of the participants' experience, along with their interpretation of the context and suggested reasons for decisions and actions taken.

While the work of Hon and Grunig (1999), in particular, influenced my methodological direction, their analysis of the quality of relationships and their questionnaire approach to relationship outcomes could not be applied fully to the relationships between archbishop, diocesan priests and laity examined in this thesis. The purposive and snowball selection of interviewees was not intended to achieve an overall statistical validity because so many participants from the Vatican Council experience of more than 40 years ago are now deceased. However, the selection was probably as representative as possible of those still living. The interviews were based on

protocols as outlined, but they were conducted in an open, discursive fashion owing to the varying experiences and recollections and often the advancing age of the interviewees. A questionnaire approach would have had an inhibiting effect on many of the interviewees and would not have enhanced the validity of the findings.

Empirical/interpretivist

An empirical/interpretivist strategy was chosen in preference to theoretical or positivist, because it was clear from the research statement that there would be an accumulation of factual data which would need interpretation by participants and observers who had first-hand experience of the phenomenon, and an attempt, with the help of the archival material, to assess their interpretations in terms of reliability and validity.

Not so much a case study...

What has emerged is a project that is 'almost' a case study, understood by Yin as the "preferred strategy when 'how' and 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context"(1994:1). I say 'almost' because it has more breadth than depth, as in Denscombe (1998:32) where "case study research characteristically emphasises depth of study rather than breadth of study". 'Almost' is an appropriate description also because the phenomenon in this study is not contemporary for today's younger people, but was a landmark in the

history of the Catholic Church and left a strong impression on all priests and interested laity who lived through it.

This is not an exploratory study because the phenomenon has been studied before, albeit from different perspectives, most prominently by Feeney (1974) and Cooney (1999b). These more general works, especially Cooney, have provided guidance in this research.

This could be classified as a descriptive study because it has attempted to describe, in narrative, chronological fashion, the details of Dublin's experience of Vatican II and the relationships between McQuaid, priests and laity over that period. It has attempted also to be an explanatory study through its approach to assessing the extent to which changes in the relationships between McQuaid, priests and laity might have been caused by his handling of Vatican II. It has, however, limited explanatory validity because there were so many other factors influencing political, cultural, social, economic and religious change in Ireland during the 1960s.

Grounded theory

Since Glaser & Strauss (1967) it has been common practice to look for evidence of grounded theory when examining qualitative data. This research may have developed a limited amount of grounded theory but not in the meaning of Strauss (1987:22) that theory is grounded by "systematically and intensively analysing data, often sentence by sentence, or phrase by phrase of the field notes, interview or other documents..."; nor

in the meaning of Schwandt (2001:110) that grounded theory methodology is "a specific, highly developed, rigorous set of procedures for producing formal, substantive theory of social phenomena".

Pattern-forming

Another perceived function of in-depth qualitative research is its capacity to identify patterns of behaviour. There has been some opportunity here for pattern-forming because McQuaid was at once complex and predictable. He remained an enigma to many people, even those close to him, but because he was fixed in his attitudes and unbending in his decisions, regardless of how unpopular they might be, it has been possible, through the evidence of those who experienced him in different roles, to detect patterns in what he did and what he said.

Relationship mapping

McQuaid had many relationships with priests and laity, individually and within groups. The Dublin diocesan priests numbered more than 500 in the 1960s, some of whom worked close to him, others whom he effectively never met. There were priests who were his secretaries, top diocesan administrators, directors of diocesan bodies, parish priests, curates, chaplains, seminary professors, university professors and lecturers and there were senior seminarians training for the priesthood. The laity could be classified into an even larger number of groups within the 800,000 Catholics for whom he was Archbishop. These included people who never met him, whether practising or non-practising Catholics, those who were active in

parishes, taught in Catholic schools or worked in other organisations under Catholic auspices, were members of lay bodies such as the Legion of Mary or the Knights of St. Columbanus, and broadcasters, journalists and others. There were also several hundred religious order priests, brothers and nuns who worked in the diocese and were observers of, but not participants in the relationships to be discussed.

Following Dewey (1927), J.Grunig (1984) and many others, McQuaid's relationships could be with latent, aware or active publics, all of whom were capable of independent interaction with one another, and by that interaction further influencing their relationships with McQuaid. One person could be a member of several publics at the one time.

Appendix C (p. 552) gives examples from McQuaid's stakeholder relationship network.

Reliability

The transparency with which this research process has been described has ensured that another researcher could replicate the interviews and follow the same protocols and, while their background knowledge, experience and relationships with the interviewees would be necessarily different, they could accumulate similar data. The reliability of the evidence, as used to draw conclusions, in conjunction with the archival material, has been aided by the manner in which the interviewees were selected and triangulated against one other to detect thematic patterns and strength of impact of

relational episodes. Time would, however, be a factor in replication as the interviews took place over a 16-month period from July 2002.

Caution with interviews

The average age of the interviewees was 72.6 years, ranging 56 to 88. This could be a factor in judging reliability of their evidence. Vatican II was, however, a major experience in all of their lives as priests or as laity. It left a strong impression and their memories of it were probably better than of more recent events. A few apologised for the unreliability of their short-term memories but when they came to McQuaid and Vatican II they were sharp in recall of detail. Some were vague about exact dates. In the earlier interviews I tried to let them raise topics before I suggested them, but as the process went on, I intervened more actively and this reduced the danger of selective recall. I took care to probe without pushing and to avoid leading questions which would reveal my own views. I had been anxious that priests, knowing I was making approaches to others and that they might be next, might 'conspire' together to agree a 'sanitised' and 'safe' account and interpretation of events, especially because of child sex abuse by clerics being so highly profiled at the time. I did not find any evidence of such a 'corporate' response. Each priest was open and recalled his personal memories, even some that were critical of himself. I did not have any such anxiety with the lay people interviewed, nor was there evidence to suggest any reasons for anxiety. Another danger to reliability lay in the attitudes that they had towards McQuaid. People tended to form fixed views on McQuaid, for or against him, regardless of whether or not they knew him.

The 'cobwebs', explained below, show how the interviewees were a balanced selection to represent both sides.

Construct validity

The research design has been implemented, step by step, in a manner which made it possible to draw valid conclusions, but, as in all research, human instruments were an essentially imperfect part of the process. However, through the use of multiple sources, triangulation and caution against bias on the part of the interviewer and those interviewed, the potential ill-effects of the human element were reduced as far as possible.

Internal validity

Where links between processes and outcomes, between cause and effect, were suggested, a sceptical approach was adopted to ensure sufficient evidence before proposing valid conclusions.

External validity

While some of the results of this research could be generalised for other dioceses, caution would be needed because of the hierarchical structure of the Catholic Church and the traditional, effectively independent position, that bishops have in their own dioceses. I chose to follow the position of theorists such as Yin who considered the difficulty in generalising from one study to another and suggested it was better for an analyst "to generalise findings to 'theory', analogous to the way that a scientist generalises from experimental results to theory"(1994:37). In this study, limited external

validity has been achieved through consideration of the findings against the underpinning theoretical concepts of the research.

Credibility

The interviewees were a balance between theological conservatives and liberals, those friendly and not so friendly to McQuaid, and those who knew him well and only knew him from a distance. The selection could be seen to offer a reasonably complete perspective on the situation within the Dublin diocese between 1959 and 1972.

Objectivity

Boog et al (1998) examined the 'horizontal' character of the relationship between the researcher and the researched and how it can change in the course of a project. Keune refers to the 'dialogic relation' which "stresses the importance of a continuous awareness of the tensions that can occur in the relationships between researchers and researched: too much detachment versus too much involvement"(1998:199). I was concerned that objectivity might be weakened by my closeness to events and personalities and views I might have retained, and my friendship, or at least acquaintanceship with, a number of the interviewees. Following re-examination of the interview transcripts and archive notes, I was satisfied that the findings and conclusions accurately reflected the evidence from these primary sources.

Cobwebs

I used the cobweb approach in assessing the interviewees, to confirm the balance in the ultimate selection and demonstrate the validity of the subsequent triangulation. I made a judgement on the profile of each interviewee, as drawn from the transcript, the impressions that I formed at the interview, writings by that person and other contacts I had with them. The outcome of this exercise indicated that, in the circumstances - events of 40 years ago, elderly respondents - the selection was probably as balanced as it could be and the emerging data would be valid for triangulation.

Appendix C (at p. 569) gives

- The headings under which the cobweb exercise was conducted
- The scores and averages under each heading

Interviews to archives or vice versa

There were two options – to conduct interviews first and use them to direct specific searches in the archives, or vice versa. The first option was chosen because the interviews gave holistic accounts of the phenomenon from a cross-section of witnesses, while the archives, being abundant, were not complete because it was not possible to know how many letters, either to confirm or discount evidence, had not been placed there nor opened to examination. It can be argued that the interviews, being subject to possible memory lapses and selective recall, were less reliable as evidence and might have been used only to fill out points emerging from the archives. I was

satisfied that the triangulation, within the cross section of people who were interviewed, enhanced reliability and, in this case, was the optimum means of achieving the aims of the research.

Incomplete

The archival collection, while large and impressive, with so much to see in McQuaid's small, controlled handwriting, contains only a small fraction of the immense correspondence that he conducted over many years. The incompleteness of the archives would not have allowed, on their own, a complete and holistic account of McQuaid the person, his handling of Vatican II and the changes in his public relationships with priests and laity. L.Ardle MacMahon (interview) says McQuaid was constantly writing letters and might do several during short ten-minute gaps between visitors during the day and that he also used the telephone a lot. There were, however, illuminations as seen, for instance, in his regular correspondence with his old Clongowes schoolfriend, Finbar Ryan, Archbishop of Port of Spain, Trinidad, West Indies. There are letters from Ryan to McQuaid, very personal and often intriguing, referring to matters from early letters, but we have not McQuaid's side of the correspondence. Aidan Lehane showed me many personal letters he had from McQuaid.

CLASSIFICATION FOR FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings and discussion have each been presented in three sections:

- John Charles McQuaid – Man and Manager

- Narrative account, with themes and relational episodes, over four distinct but overlapping phases of the Vatican II issue life cycle, named from the Femers *et al* model (2000:255) – emergence, 1959-62; dissemination, 1962-65; establishment, 1965-68 and erosion, 1968-72.
- Account of archbishop, priests, laity relationships, under headings of expectations in 1959, indicators, cultivation strategies and change between 1959 and 1972.

It was important to attempt an understanding of McQuaid before describing his handling of the Council issue and approaching an understanding of the relationships and whether and why they changed over the period.

Chapters 5 through 8 have incorporated the 11 themes and 13 relational episodes which were drawn from the interview transcripts:

Theme 1	Preparing Dublin for the Council
Theme 2	Early attitudes to the Council
Theme 3	Theology for the laity
Theme 4	Early Council documents
Theme 5	Media during the Council
Theme 6	Implementing decisions of the Council
Theme 7	Collegiality
Theme 8	Ecumenism
Theme 9	Catechesis and preaching
Theme 10	Erosion of Council enthusiasm

Theme 11 Media after the Council

Episode 1 Pope John XXIII announces the Council

Episode 2 Radharc television documentaries

Episode 3 First Session of the Council

Episode 4 Second Session of the Council

Episode 5 Third Session of the Council

Episode 6 Fourth Session of the Council

Episode 7 Dublin Diocesan Press Office

Episode 8 “No Change”

Episode 9 “The Empty Chair”

Episode 10 Mater Dei Institute

Episode 11 *Humanae Vitae*

Episode 12 Three letters on contraception

Episode 13 Retiral and death

Secondary material

Some contextual secondary material was included in the findings because it had a relevance in support of or against the evidence, or its special mention in the interviews and archives gave reason to believe that it had an added importance in understanding the evidence. This included McQuaid’s pastoral letters and other pronouncements, evidence from certain witnesses now deceased and writings from the time and more recently by interviewees and others.

Serendipity

The research revealed some evidence that could have been expected and other evidence that questioned earlier research. There were also moments of serendipity as when, by chance, in the archives, I found a loose, unclassified letter from McQuaid's spiritual director, in which, I believe, was revealed for the first time an important aspect of his private personality and some reason for his attitudes, views and behaviour.

4: JOHN CHARLES McQUAID – MAN AND MANAGER

THIS CHAPTER is the first of seven on the findings of the research. It looks at McQuaid, a man dedicated to his work as Archbishop, never off-duty, a man who showed an unfailing concern for the sick, the poor and the under-privileged. He combined this, however, with a grandiose, sometimes renaissance-like courtly style and the authoritarian approach to management that was usual at the time, with a rigid insistence on discipline and obedience, especially in small matters. He was often criticised, sometimes unfairly, in the media and elsewhere, but he never countered these criticisms, commenting upon them only to his small group of trusted confidants.

Note: Names underlined indicate exclusive interview material. Normally first name on first reference, surname only on subsequent references.

A HOLY MAN

Interviewees stress McQuaid's holiness. This is a difficult concept to describe, but they say: "He oozed sanctity, you'd feel it in his presence"(Vincent Gallagher); "I felt that I was always in the presence of a holy man, I regarded this man as a man of prayer"(Fr. Tom Butler); "...definitely a very deeply religious person"(Joe Power); "I would say he has a very high place in heaven because he always acted according to his

conscience. Always a great man of principle”(Fr. J.P.Battelle); “I revered him as a person of profound holiness, a spirituality contemplative in form, which opened out into a pastoral ministry”(Mgr. John Moloney). Moloney then cites some areas of this ministry – the poor, the sick, education, culture. Within six months of McQuaid’s death, groups of people were gathering each Sunday around his tomb in Dublin’s Pro-Cathedral, asking for his intercession and seeking his beatification (Feeney 1974:1).

Three elements were used to define the nature of McQuaid’s holiness – faith, obedience and charity. The centrality of his faith was “very, very strong and strident” for Moloney. Ann Lee says he had “great faith in his angel guardian”.

McQuaid, with Mgr. Ardle MacMahon and O.G.Dowling, Diocesan Press Officer, drafted replies to questions from author Tim Pat Coogan in 1965. As to what books he read, they listed the classics, Latin and French, works of theology and scripture, especially of the French scholars; periodicals of theology, scripture and current affairs; also medicine and psychology. His favourite spiritual authors were St.Thomas Aquinas, St.John of the Cross, St.Teresa of Avila and St.Francis de Sales (Ar-32). Some would be surprised that de Sales was a favourite, because de Sales’ gentle approach, as writer and bishop of Geneva, and his preference to lead with honey rather than a stick, would seem in contrast to the perception of McQuaid as a strict, often harsh, disciplinarian. Coogan sent similar written questions to all of the Irish

bishops, in research for his book, *Ireland Since the Rising*. McQuaid did not reply (conversation, 15/2/06).

Fr. Aidan Lehane, remembering McQuaid's regular visits to the Holy Ghost Fathers' Rockwell College, in Co. Tipperary, says: "He had a taste for good detective stories and Josephine Tey was an author he often recommended".

When Father A was a student in Clonliffe College, McQuaid frequently recommended de Sales, giving him his own signed copy of de Sales' *Introduction to the Devout Life*. In 1955, at McQuaid's suggestion, Dublin Institute of Catholic Sociology (DICS) introduced a course in ascetical theology with *Introduction to the Devout Life* as the core textbook (Ar-24).

Desmond Cardinal Connell believes that, for McQuaid, obedience was the ultimate test of holiness. He was obedient himself, with absolute certitude, to the instructions and wishes of the Pope, seeing this as the will of God, even when he didn't like it. Connell tells how a priest once said to McQuaid that a certain other priest was a very holy man. And McQuaid asked: "How do you know he is holy?", and further: "Does he obey?" (Connell). Obedience to the Church and its hierarchical system explained a lot of McQuaid's actions (Mgr. Conor K. Ward).

There are indications that Pope Paul VI appreciated McQuaid's obedience and loyalty. McQuaid's note (4/1/66) to Amleto Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State:

This afternoon I have received by air-freight from Milano a case of exquisite confectionary (sic) with a Christmas Card from His Holiness...It is but another stimulus to a filial loyalty in which I trust I shall never, with God's help, be found wanting (Ar-18).

McQuaid's charity, especially his kindness to people in trouble, was praised in many interviews: "I always thought that he was a very humble man, a very charitable man. Charity was the keynote of his priesthood"(Mgr. Stephen Greene).

Spiritual writers do not regard abstemiousness as essential for holiness, but it has often been a feature of holy people. "[McQuaid] was so obviously abstemious and totally committed to his job. He lived for it"(Fr. Tony Gaughan). Gaughan recalls McQuaid's parish visits for confirmations and, at dinner afterwards, he would be "at the top of table, fiddling with a bit of boiled chicken and then a bit of rice. And then a cup of tea". Others concur with this: "He might take a few sips of wine. Just a few sips. He was very abstemious. He seemed to eat very little...He always had the chicken and the rice"(Battelle). Lehane says McQuaid never drank [alcohol] on his visits to Rockwell College but, as so often with McQuaid stories, there was the quirky side: "He felt competent to judge the bouquet on a glass of wine...".

SPIRITUAL CERTITUDE

McQuaid's spiritual director, Fr. Denis Fahey, CSSp, wrote in 1930, admonishing him for continuing to seek certitude in his private, spiritual

life, in his relationship with God (Ar-5). Achievement of this certitude always escaped him, as was inevitable, and it may have contributed to the insecurity, the uncertainty, with which he approached his final judgement with God.

Fahey, a controversial, right wing writer, whom McQuaid opposed in later years, in this case advised the young priest on the weakness in his approach to God and how he could improve in his spiritual life:

“Our Lord wants you to turn your gaze and your energy upward in faith in Him and he wants you not to seek to get sense-assurance...You always aim at accuracy in speech and rightly...Now, I have been trying to combat your tendency to get satisfaction for sense faculties’ demand for assurance and you have, very often, in the phase after you had promised to look upward to Our Lord and keep your gaze on Him and on His Interests first, slipped back again....I say this because you are inclined to seek for intellectual certitude as to your exact position in the spiritual life. That is secondary altogether to the question whether Our Lord finds you ever looking at this side of all events, irrespective of self”.

This letter was found by chance in the archives. It lay unclassified in a small box with some random press cuttings, and would not have been seen had not there been a delay that morning in gaining access to other documents owing to an attempted burglary. It indicates how complete was McQuaid’s desire for certitude in everything.

McQuaid remained a man of prayer and this is reflected in his pastoral letters. It is possible he never managed to follow Fahey's advice, but kept slipping back and worrying about not being able to achieve personal spiritual certitude. Some did not like the firm hand with which he ruled his diocese but he was consistent and predictable, with intellectual certitude that he was always right and it was his duty to rule in this way. Cooney refers to McQuaid's "unshakeable certitude that his path in life, though not without its share of emotional tumult and unexpected directions, was guided by Jesus Christ"(1999b:13).

THE BISHOP'S DUTY

McQuaid's consciousness of his role and duty as bishop is clear in his sermons and writings, summed up by Butler:

His mentality was that 'I am the Pope's man here in Ireland, here in this big archdiocese of Dublin, I am the guardian of the Faith, I am the custodian of the Covenant. I am the teacher of faith and morals' and I think that was a grave responsibility and it weighed heavily on him.

This conviction led to a rigorous defence of what he regarded as the rights of the Church in all spheres of public and private life. Greene sees this as "paramount" in his thinking: "...there is no doubt about that...he would not have changed...He would have been a force to be reckoned with". This also led to the contrast between the "very humble man" in private (Greene) and the "theatricality" of the public display of his office (Fr. Tom Stack). Stack

points to the Irish tradition of "church ascendancy" which peaked in the years before Vatican II when the Church "triumphant" was dominant: "...everybody was in awe of the bishop, people kissed his ring and he wore all the paraphernalia and cloaks". This was all many people saw of McQuaid, either at ceremonies or through photographs in the newspapers. Some saw it as ridiculous and overdone, but it appealed to others. Father C remembers

one woman, who liked him, saying: 'what I love about him is he is so churchy'. And it struck me that's a good description because if you met him you didn't feel you were meeting a man, you felt you were meeting a church. You felt you were impressed by him.

Derek Scott recalls McQuaid's visits to the Blackrock College Boys' Club:

It was a great state occasion. He would be driven up in his huge car. He was always attired as an archbishop of the time should be and escorted by various minions. And you met him at the door and you kissed his ring and you did all the usual things. And he arrived spot on time.

Mgr. Patrick Corish says this style was what McQuaid felt was required of him as Archbishop. MacMahon sees it as a style of leadership, the "mystique approach", as exercised by people like General de Gaulle and not the populist approach of, say Pope John XXIII, which shares with everybody. Connell often got the impression that McQuaid would have looked to Pope

Pius XII as the model, and "Pius XII did give that impression of the supreme monarch".

McQuaid saw his strong predecessor, Paul Cardinal Cullen (1852-78), as a model, describing him as "silent, magnanimous, farseeing" and "as heedless of self-justification after death, as he was intrepid in administration during life (1956:209). David Sheehy recognises this parallel with Cullen in McQuaid's austere public image, "impervious or indifferent to criticism and needless of justification" (2003a:205).

In 1933, McQuaid preached at the episcopal consecration of Joseph Byrne, CSSp, saying the bishop "has for task to keep his [Christ's] spouse, the Church, inviolate, by the stainless orthodoxy of His Teaching" and that:

"He is the fount of spiritual power in his diocese...the father of the children of the Church, who are born to God in Baptism...the Church shall ever have for ordinary Rulers, Bishops" (McQuaid 1956:124-5).

McQuaid was diligent and constant in his duties, and "would reply to everything himself, personally...and rapidly, in writing" (Gallagher); "He was prodigious" (Fr. Eltin Griffin); "He preferred to take short breaks rather than long holidays" (Lee). Several of those breaks were in Rockwell College, which he described to Lehane as "a few days withdrawal".

INSECURITY

McQuaid's certitude in faith, in obedience and in all of his statements and actions would seem unquestionable, but there were times in his life when some of his great certitudes were undermined. For instance, his mother, Jenny, died, aged 22, just days after his birth and he did not know until he was 16 that his stepmother, Agnes, was not his natural mother (Cooney 1999b:35).

McQuaid often spoke of the importance of one's mother, an example being given by Greene: "I said, 'your episcopal ring is a very nice thing', and he said, 'that's my mother's ring, I had a stone inserted into it. They always said to me, 'always cherish your mother'. You only have one mother. Always keep her very much in mind'". Gaughan, backing his own written account (2000), says McQuaid's shyness and sometimes overbearing manner were a cover for what was an insecurity and that he had doubts himself and about himself which he never revealed.

The extensive correspondence from Archbishop Finbar Ryan to McQuaid shows that both men had the same outlook on religious matters, as when Ryan wrote (26/12/59):

"...the Catholic educational machinery which you have set in motion in Dublin is the greatest contribution to the fulfilment of our Patrician destiny that could be made. I wish I could be sure that this is appreciated in Ireland and in Rome. Don't weaken"(Ar-16).

The television documentaries on the opening of the McQuaid archives (RTE Television 1998a, 1998b) feature a voice-over at the beginning which was not identified to viewers. It was Mgr. Tom Fehily. The interviews with Fehily and others had been completed and the cameras turned off, but the sound was still on and Fehily spoke, unrehearsed and unprompted, not aware he was being recorded. The director kept the sound going (Sheehy conversation). The story was repeated by Fehily for this research, with slight amendments and a final sentence:

"I saw him shortly before he died and he said: 'I am very frightened of dying'. And I said: 'Your Grace, why would you be frightened?' He said: 'Why wouldn't I be, Father?' ... 'Well', I said, 'when you think of all the things you did' and I listed all the extraordinary work he did for the poor and the new parishes he established and the new churches he built, all that sort of thing, the number of religious orders he brought in, the number of new colleges he founded, etc. He said 'Father, all of that may be true but not one of those are mentioned at your judgement, not one of them'. He said: 'You are only asked...with what love did you do what you did. Love of me or love of your own promotion. I don't know the answer and that's why I am worried'. And then I said to him: 'Ah, Your Grace, I am sure that everything will be grand at your judgement', and he said: 'Father, dear, and who' – I remember it so clearly – 'Father, dear, and who gave you permission to sit in the judgement seat of God?'.

There are several references to the final judgement. When Louis McRedmond sought an interview with McQuaid for *The Irish Times*, he declined (2/3/70), but commented: "You are kind to write in such a strain,

but I must wait for the judgement of God on that chapter, a merciful judgement, I hope, for myself and for all with whom I have had to deal or who have dealt with me"(Ar-53). When Fr. Roland Burke Savage, SJ, was planning to write his biography, McQuaid hoped (5/2/64) he would

be far beyond its reach and the reaction that it will arouse on earth. And, by then, I shall have learned, in judgement, the genuine chiaroscuro of my poor image before God. *Unicus et pauper* I shall certainly be in that moment, so keep on praying for me in your gentle charity (Ar-79).

He wrote to Burke Savage (2/10/66): "...I can indeed deceive myself, but not all the time, more especially as I am acutely aware that judgement cannot be distant"(Ar-79). When McQuaid addressed the Public Image Committee (24/1/64) he "reminded the meeting of their duty to point out anything that is defective because if they did not they must render an account for it at their judgement"(Ar-61).

As McQuaid was dying in Loughlinstown Hospital, Dublin, he rose from the pillow and asked staff nurse Margaret O'Dowd "if he had any chance of reaching heaven. She told him that if he, as Archbishop could not get to heaven, few would. This answer appeared to satisfy him and he lay back on the pillow to await death"(Cooney 1999b:432).

SHY, REMOTE, FORMAL

McQuaid's shyness is a consistent theme in the interviews. "I thought he was basically a shy man. It wasn't easy to have a conversation with him. He would say something to you and you would say something back and he might just suddenly move on to the next person"(Scott); "...and people's distance from him, which he was aware of, didn't help him at all with regard to overcoming his shyness"(Butler); "He was shy all right"(Greene); "He was very shy"(Battelle); "pathologically shy, he was a very, very shy person...But apart from that, he had a difficulty in communicating with fellow-adults"(Gaughan).

Connell believes McQuaid "found it hard at events like confirmation"; likewise Griffin: "He didn't go in for photographs after confirmation or anything like that". McQuaid, however, did not agree with this. When correcting the proofs for Burke Savage's article in *Studies*, he said (19/1/66): "I think it inaccurate that I dislike ceremonies"(Ar-79).

The Public Image Committee reported (1964) that "our bishops are very remote" and they pointed at McQuaid, suggesting that

the formation of a positive image may be assisted by the cumulative effect of little things such as sedulous meeting of parents after confirmation, appearing informally on television, allowing informal press photographs and in general, in so far as is possible, by dropping the formal manner" (Ar-61).

It would be easy to attribute McQuaid's formality to his shyness, but "that was not peculiar to Archbishop McQuaid. That was the custom of the time, that kind of formality"(Connell); "In those days everyone was formal. All men wore hats, or if they were lower class they wore caps. He came from that sort of world..." (Corish). "I think most bishops were the same then. They were expected to be solemn"(Father C). Seán Mac Réamoinn says McQuaid may have been shy but "he certainly had no hesitation in putting his ideas forward in written form or at a distance".

WIDE KNOWLEDGE AND PRECISION

McQuaid had wide general knowledge, "an encyclopedic knowledge on a lot of issues that weren't associated with the Church"(Greene). MacMahon also uses the word "encyclopedic", Father A "unbelievable", Griffin "extraordinary". Bishop Donal Murray says it was "probably from many years teaching...that might have been part of it...he had a huge capacious kind of mind...an absolutely photographic memory." Some mention McQuaid's precision and thoroughness in everything and how he expected the same from others: "He was meticulous in checking out information...He was the most magnificent time-keeper you ever came across"(Battelle); "Well, of course, he was very exact"(Fehily).

He could be a genial and interesting host. In January 1962 he had Ed Roth, Director General of Telefís Eireann, Michael Barry, Director of Programmes and Eamonn Andrews, Chairman, for dinner at his home in Killiney and they all wrote appreciative letters of thanks. Roth said how he "particularly

enjoyed the informal and extremely interesting conversation with you after dinner...and may I say Your Grace's selection of cigars is excellent"(Ar-25).

McQuaid always dressed in formal episcopal attire and insisted that all clerics, not just his own priests and students, must at all times wear their hats out of doors. Gallagher says McQuaid at Blackrock College "... was always impeccable. You would never see the man in casual wear..." He was strong on traditional etiquette, always, for instance, writing his letters by hand and expecting the same in return. The archives show Dowling's letters to him from the Diocesan Press Office were always handwritten, as were those from his fellow bishops. McQuaid's spidery, upright handwriting was small, but legible, and it never wavered. "My understanding was that I should always handwrite my letters to him. And that he would handwrite them back"(Ward).

GENTLE AND COURTEOUS, COLD AND AUSTERE

People hold conflicting views about McQuaid. Those closest to him tend to say he was gentle and courteous, while many at a distance share a perception that he was cold and austere: "...a very gentle person...a very courteous man, to everybody"(Lee); "...ever so gentle...And his manners, they were impeccable"(Butler). Lehane emphasises courtesy, as in the brief letters of thanks he received after every McQuaid visit to Rockwell. For Margaret McMahon, "he was extremely likeable...when you went into the room it was like as if there was an infrared heater on"(RTE Television

1998a). McQuaid told Whyte that a Belgian friend, often under attack, once told him: "It is never permitted to one to be discourteous"(Ar-82).

McQuaid was meticulous in replying immediately to correspondence. It must therefore have grieved him when Papal Nuncio Sensi wrote (14/2/66) about letters of 13/1/66 and 26/1/66 to which he had not replied. McQuaid's note (16/2/66) on Sensi's letter read: "Ansd. I regret very much that Your Excellency should have been obliged to write me. The simple truth is that I have, at this season, been very hard pressed at work"(Ar-21). As McQuaid told Lehane he never let anybody else open his letters, this is surprising. Was it a sign he was weakening, or had been ill, or did his loyalty to others cause him to cover up an oversight?

McQuaid's image in Blackrock College was not the aloofness and remoteness often associated with him as archbishop: "He was the most popular member on the staff", although never in terms of being 'hail-fellow-well-met' (Mgr. Jerome Curtin); "He knew every pupil, every boarder in the school"(Gallagher). Indeed, there seemed to be a magnetism about him, as Gallagher recalls another boy saying to him one evening: "Aren't we lucky to be here, during the time, the term of the Mickser - we called him Mickser - because he is a man in a million". Fr. Dermot McCarthy, as a student in Clonliffe College, was another who noticed this appeal: "There was a bit of a Mona Lisa look about him. You weren't sure whether he was smiling or not. But he had a magnetic presence".

Gaughan believes McQuaid never shook off the schoolmasterly, stand-offish manner, that one can develop as part of imposing discipline on others: "And I suppose, unconsciously, if you are like that for a number of years, your formative years, you tend to continue that way". Fr. Austin Flannery uses the word "bossy" to describe him, saying that he "seemed to regard it as his duty to find out what was going on, and he did".

His closest friends, also, were aware of aspects in his manner which were criticised by others. One of them admits that people would say he tended to be a bit sharp and caustic in his style, especially in written communications. Battelle refers to the stiff upper lip, "because he wanted to be so correct and he never wanted to show anybody that basically he had any feelings at all".

For Gay Byrne, the 'ogre' aspect to which McQuaid himself referred at the opening of the Diocesan Press Office, was enhanced by his style at ceremonies in the Pro-Cathedral and at confirmations: "The crowds would be out in force and genuflecting and an altar boy holding the ends of the long cappa magna. And again, the austere pose". For Father B: "...there was a terrible awe and...he swept into a sacristy...People were afraid of him...that was the kind of atmosphere he created. Publicly, anyhow...". John Horgan has the impression that "he cultivated this image that he projected to the world of the austere, remote, unapproachable figure. I think probably because it enhanced his authority, or he felt that it enhanced his authority". Horgan never had a private conversation with McQuaid, but

believes that underneath this austerity he could be "quite impish, almost, and taking a delight in how people were affected by the outward mien that he adopted."

The Public Image Committee (1964) described a strong public image of McQuaid, in the light of which everything he said or did was coloured, even if it was not a "true image":

The public image of the Archbishop of Dublin is entirely negative: a man who forbids, a man who is stern and aloof from the lives of the people, a man who doesn't meet the people (as they want him to) at Church functions, at public gatherings, or television or in the streets, who writes deep Pastoral letters in theological and canonical language that is remote from the lives of the people (Ar-61).

HIS 'ENEMIES'

McQuaid, in correspondence and conversation, frequently referred to his attackers as his 'enemies'. Burke Savage tried to answer the criticisms of McQuaid that he was "too aloof from his flock, anti-Protestant, anti-liturgical, anti-artistic, interferes in the affairs of UCD and a meddler in politics"(1965b:320). He then suggested that for McQuaid, "despite the clamour of vocal critics, the number of his enemies is few indeed"(1965b:322). Burke Savage meant well but, by raising these points so succinctly, he seems to have provided ammunition for the 'enemies'.

When McQuaid referred to 'my enemies', they were not just his enemies in Dublin, but in Rome also. Bishop Patrick Dunne, his Auxiliary, wrote to him from Italy (28/9/58) referring to Archbishop Carinci's secretary with a "bundle of literature for Your Grace. She is a Signora Castiglione-Masero, a widow, I should think". McQuaid's note (4/10/58): "What a strange interview, with a strange secretary: If I had a widow for Secretary what would not my enemies say at Rome. And they have, as I know, put in a lot of work on me already" (Ar-7).

McQuaid was the subject of attack, especially in *The Irish Times*, from long before the 1960s and Vatican II. Much of it was rooted in the part he played in the Mother and Child issue in 1950 and his meetings and correspondence with the Minister for Health, Dr. Noël Browne, which led to Browne's resignation and the Government withdrawing the scheme which would have given free healthcare to children up to 16 years of age. This famous occasion of Church and State in conflict in modern Ireland, is not, however, the subject of this thesis, but the outcome was the fall of the Government in 1951 (see Whyte 1971, 1980; Browne 1986; Horgan 2000). Despite this, McQuaid told Whyte that over 29 years he found a complete absence of contention between Church and State, they were "very pleasant years" and he received courtesy and co-operation (Ar-82).

In 1965, an attack by *Irish Times* columnist Myles na gCopaleen (Brian O'Nolan) nearly led to a libel case, but McQuaid, and his legal advisers, declined to proceed (Ar-35). There had been references by Myles in his *Irish*

Times column to Merrion Square (purchased for the diocese by Edward Byrne, the previous Archbishop) and an old debate over whether it might be the site for a new Catholic Cathedral and Dowling had written a long reply which seems to have added fuel to Myles' fire. Myles then came back in his 'George Knowall' column in the Carlow paper, *The Nationalist & Leinster Times*:

"... In Dublin there are tens of thousands of poorish people living and trying to rear families in slums, not infrequently competing for accommodation with rats, while all over the area (though admittedly in the tonier parts) abound solid, princely often towering buildings housing communities of nuns doing absolutely nothing all day (apart from getting outside at least three square meals) but giving glory to God...Every parish teems with male clergy who, apart from morning ecclesiastical duties, mostly on Sundays, have practically nothing to do with their time, thanks to State social services and highly organised lay charities"

McQuaid told Burke Savage, from Rome (3/11/65): "You should watch the Carlow paper. I have seldom seen anything worse than George Knowall's letter on the priests and nuns of Dublin. (He is, I am assured, Myles na gCopaleen)" (Ar-79). McQuaid instructed Dowling not to get into correspondence with the *Nationalist*, and referred to the "unfortunate letter of O.G.Dowling that provoked" this attack. There was some concern and McQuaid's solicitor, Edward G. Gleeson, wrote (9/11/65):

“...My thoughts on reflection and reasoning could fill some pages but may I just say that I am of the view that at the moment there is no positive step – overt or otherwise which can usefully or wisely be taken.

“If and when another ‘attack’ comes the problem must be reviewed in the light thereof and my opinion then may be different. I say this because sooner or later a stand may have to be made against this insidious type of thing.

McQuaid’s note (12/11/65): “Very grateful. I have never defended myself, nor should I, unless the office of archbishop were attacked. Mgr. Barrett will be a good consultant”(Ar-79). Cecil Barrett said McQuaid’s “silence on the occasion of criticism has been commented on with wonder and even regret”(1973:7).

Myles na gCopaleen did not long survive the controversy. Dowling wrote to McQuaid (4/5/66): “I did not attend poor Myles’ funeral, as I did not know him personally and thought my presence might be misconstrued, so I just said a prayer instead”(Ar-39). O’Nolan, who also had the *nom-de-plume* of Flann O’Brien, was a pupil at Blackrock when McQuaid was Dean of Studies. Cooney says he imitated McQuaid’s writing and provided his versions to other boys as official excuses for undone home work (1999b:59).

Attacks increased through the 1960s, with publications, notably *The Manchester Guardian*, and *Herder Correspondence* (English language edition of *Herder Korrespondenz*), publishing articles which criticised the way McQuaid

ruled his diocese and his alleged slowness in bringing in changes after Vatican II.

McQuaid commented to Burke Savage (16/1/64) about Peter Lennon's articles in *The Manchester Guardian* (8-11/1/64), which referred to him as a 'Grey Eminence': "I find it hard to understand the venom. It is very untrue, from my own knowledge of my own actions...I think that the Faith will not suffer, and that alone counts"(Ar-79). He told John Watt, a former UCD lecturer, who defended him in a letter to *The Manchester Guardian* (16/1/64) that the Lennon article "is so severe that I am encouraged to hope that it will not really damage the Faith, and that is what alone counts" (Ar-59). He also referred to Lennon when he addressed the Public Image Committee (24/1/64): "Unfortunately this meeting coincides with a campaign concerning my method of dealing with affairs in the Diocese. This is an epiphenomenon"(Ar-61). Referring again to Lennon (who was from Dublin), McQuaid told Burke Savage (26/1/64):

This form of attack is another type of loneliness. But I hope with God's help and Our Lady's kindly assistance, to see in it only what God permits for his own purposes – very hidden purposes indeed. Ultimately my silence will be understood, but by then I shall be, I hope, with God"(Ar-79).

He confided again to Burke Savage (2/2/64): "You do not think that I worry at these attacks and you are right. But the isolation they effect brings me, I hope, closer to Our Divine Lord"(Ar-79). McQuaid regretted the Lennon

attack, telling Whyte: "...that poor lad whose mother and brother are daily communicants. His mother didn't go to her accustomed church for several weeks after those articles appeared" (Ar-82).

Herder Correspondence (July 1965) referred to a "curial mentality" in the Dublin archdiocese and McQuaid responding "hesitantly to the new winds from Rome". It raised all the common attacks on McQuaid and, by seeming to refute them, had the opposite effect of re-inforcing them, such as his "innate hatred of Protestants". The Editor, Herbert Auhofer, sent complimentary copies around the diocese and apparently to every primary school teacher and, with his copy to McQuaid (14/6/65), wrote: "...We hope that our article has laid some ghosts and will help to ease the way for your pastoral work in Dublin for which I respectfully wish you every success"(Ar-58). Dowling replied to Auhofer (18/6/65):

It is, as your article implies, paradoxical that the only diocese so far to implement the Vatican Decree on Mass Communications by establishing a full-time press office in charge of a layman should be accused of failing to appreciate the *aggiornamento* and of possessing a curial mentality (Ar-33).

In a self-memo (22/6/65), McQuaid said Bishop William Philbin of Down and Connor had told him some bishops were wondering for how long they should continue to send news items to *The Irish Times*. "'The Irish Times had been treating me shamefully'. I thanked him and made no suggestion..."(Ar-58).

In reply to McQuaid's letter (3/11/65) about media coverage and press criticism, Burke Savage (10/11/65) said he felt "very sad" that McQuaid was suffering so much. McQuaid underlined "suffering so much" and noted "This is an error" – in other words, he had not admitted to suffering (Ar-33).

MacMahon says:

I think he was aware also that there were various sources of criticism [of him] and some of these would have been inimical to the influence of the Catholic Church in this country. About education and medicine. Areas like that where, obviously, the Church had enormous influence in the Republic and there would be people who would have been ideologically very different and would resent that and would take the opportunity of voicing it.

MacMahon picks out *The Irish Times* and says it was McQuaid's policy "never to reply to that kind of criticism...I suppose too it was a measure of his enormous influence". Lehane says "When McQuaid was hit he took the suffering in silence, but it hurt deeply". He recalls that McQuaid, at Rockwell, always had breakfast at 8.30 and "as he entered the President's study – where his meals were served – he would glance at the headlines of the papers without picking them up and frequently and wryly comment: 'Who's attacking me today?'"

Some see McQuaid's silence in the face of his critics as another sign of his holiness. One of Father C's friends, who was close to McQuaid, told him that McQuaid accepted the criticism and the attacks "very humbly" and "offered it up", regarding it as "something that he had to put up with for the Lord, because he had that sort of spirituality...". A comment in his pastoral letter for the Pope's 50th anniversary of ordination, June 1970, could be applied to himself:

Like the Son of God on earth, it has been his lot to be misrepresented, opposed, reviled and even hated. But is it not the promise of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, that the servant shall not be greater than his Master, and that men shall hate His faithful Apostles and disciples (Ar-18).

He assured Burke Savage (17/11/65) that he would not be worried if the *Studies* article led to further attacks: "...If one has been a whipping post for years, another few strokes do not hurt so much. Besides, if God did not permit all these comments, interpretations and calumnies, they could not be uttered at all. Some good is meant by Him. And in the end, He gets his way"(Ar-79).

The radical UCD student/journalist, John Feeney, with his left wing group, Grille, was an unconventional critic of McQuaid, writing to the newspapers to apologise to other Christians for the unecumenical tones of McQuaid's letter on church unity, picketing Clonliffe College because of plans to rebuild it at a time of serious housing shortage in the city, and attacking McQuaid on the *Late Late Show* for introducing planned giving for parish

collections (Carty 1969c). Gay Byrne then described McQuaid as "the most maligned man in the country" (*Sunday Press* 1969). Feeney (1970) attacked McQuaid as a man "hated" by considerable sections of his priests and laity and "an isolated remnant of an earlier more strident era in Irish Catholicism". Feeney was milder, though still very critical, when he "regretted the ease by which the faults of so many Catholics were all laid at the door of one single man who had reached an age when few people find it easy to break from the old ways" (1974:79) and summed up McQuaid as "a great Churchman, a great leader, and more important than all, a great follower of Christ" (1974:88).

Until the establishment of the Diocesan Press Office in 1965 McQuaid sent his press information to the *Irish Independent* and *Irish Press* but not always to the *Irish Times*. A note to from one of his secretaries (March 1962) says that year's pastoral was being given late to *The Irish Times* "because last year the Observer (England) commented on the Pastoral before it was issued and the Observer Correspondent is on the Irish Times staff" (Ar-53).

While he 'offered up' personal criticism, he could respond sharply to anything that reflected on his priests and people. Two coincidental instances involved statements from Waterford diocese, one by Bishop Daniel Cohalan, who in 1943 preached a sermon about the neglect of the poor people in Dublin's Gardiner Street slums around the corner from the affluence of O'Connell Street, and again in 1966 when a Waterford priest alleged spiritual neglect of the people in the new suburb of Ballyfermot (Ar-7).

The future Cardinal Heenan of Westminster visited Dublin in 1941 and wrote critically in the *Catholic Herald* about the poor of Dublin being "a living reproach to its citizens" and the poverty seeming to be regarded "in too many circles with complacency". He also found the young people to be "sullen and resentful of the attitude of the clergy" and wondered whether the people's Catholic faith was "a formality"(Heenan 1971:242-3). Cooney quotes Heenan and says how the criticism drew fire from McQuaid who wrote (30/12/41) to Archbishop Godfrey, Apostolic Delegate to Great Britain (also a future Cardinal of Westminster), saying the article had "deeply angered both clergy and laity in the country"(Cooney 1999b:161).

A SENSE OF HUMOUR

It surprises some that there is occasional reference in the interviews to McQuaid's quaint sense of humour and numerous anecdotes, some of which are true and others endearingly apocryphal. There are references to his humour as "sardonic"(Gaughan); "dry"(MacMahon); "funny"(Murray) or "quirky"(G.Byrne) and to the "twinkle in the eye"(Lee, Butler). There are moments of humour in his correspondence. Antrim were in the All-Ireland Hurling final at Croke Park in September 1943 and their local Bishop, Daniel Mageean of Down & Connor, was invited to throw in the ball. He wrote to McQuaid, as was the usual courtesy in another bishop's diocese, for his permission. McQuaid's note: (22/8/43): "Certainly. Throw it in"(Ar-6).

Scott recalls a well-known incident with the sixth year boys in Blackrock College which was passed down to him. McQuaid had a limp and one boy,

who was a good mimic, was performing in front of the class and strolling around with the limp and a good imitation of the voice when there was a tap on his shoulder: "The limp is in the other leg". Greene noted a "great" sense of humour, recalling a confirmation dinner when McQuaid put on a cap and described the people who went to Croke Park [gaelic games], to Dalymount Park [soccer] and Lansdowne Road [rugby].

Murray believes McQuaid got on well with the other bishops without saying much at the meetings, but what he said had impact and influence on decisions because he was bishop for one quarter of the population. He tells the story of McQuaid going into a meeting at Maynooth when a priest said to him: "What does Archbishop Walsh [of Tuam] have in his bag? and McQuaid replied: "Spanners, Father".

Whyte saw a relaxed and, and at times, humorous McQuaid during their long interview in 1969. He was at ease and "smiled often", laughing when he referred to the late Education Minister, Donogh O'Malley as "that tempestuous character" but adding he was a very good man to do business with (Ar-82).

5: VATICAN II – EMERGENCE, 1959-1962

THIS CHAPTER starts the narrative of the Vatican Council issue, through the four life-cycle stages of emergence, dissemination, establishment and erosion which continues in Chapters 6, 7 and 8. It is developed around the themes and relational episodes which have been drawn from the interviews. Also, with consideration of antecedents and expectations in 1959, it starts the process cycle in the relationships between archbishop, priests and laity, forming the link with chapters 9, 10 and 11 where relationship indicators, relational cultivation strategies and relational change are considered. Ireland, in general, was unprepared for the Council with most people, including bishops, being unaware of what it might involve, but seeds were being sown which would help priests and interested laity to understand the years ahead for the Catholic Church and its role in the modern world. Among the most prominent of these seeds were two religious and social journals, *The Furrow* and *Doctrine & Life*.

POPE JOHN XXIII ANNOUNCES THE COUNCIL

Power remembers McQuaid saying the Church needed a breath of fresh air and he believes McQuaid's initial reaction to the Council was one of welcome. David Rice, a young priest in Rome, refers to "this sense of spring in the air...this marvellous sense of freedom happening" and "a tremendous sense of euphoria". Butler saw the announcement as "completely out of the

blue". Gallagher says it was a "great surprise" and he didn't realise its significance at the time, "but John XXIII was definitely a man inspired".

Osservatore Romano, the semi-official Vatican daily newspaper, made no mention of the Council on the evening Pope John announced it and next day "sandwiched it between two other items of far less importance", a diocesan synod for the city of Rome and an update of the Code of Canon Law. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, a Jesuit bi-monthly, also with semi-official Vatican status, did not mention the Council until 2 May. Robert B. Kaiser, *Time* correspondent for Rome, said some could not believe the news of the Council because of the common perception that Councils went out with the definition of papal infallibility. In the curial offices of the Vatican, Kaiser wrote, "John's idea did not exactly galvanise the ecclesiastical bureaucrats" (1963:15-18).

The word 'ecumenical' and its association with the growing movement for re-union of the Christian churches, created an immediate expectation that this would be the purpose of the Council. These expectations were raised by elements in the Pope's announcement and by theologians, most prominently Fr. Hans Küng (1961). For Fr. Kevin (later Archbishop) McNamara, it was clear from the beginning that John XXIII saw "in this hoped-for renewal of the Church a great step forward on the road to Christian unity" (1962:viii). Fr. Michael Hurley, SJ (1962:35) suggested it would give "a new fillip to Catholic ecumenism" and help "certain present trends to establish themselves more deeply and above all to spread more widely".

RELATIONAL ANTECEDENTS AND EXPECTATIONS, 1959

Charles McCarthy identified the Church going into the 1960s with "immutable authority and inscrutable remoteness", where "rules were our guide, at all times, our first introduction to God and the Church, our final way of meeting him". There was much talk of sin, heaven and hell, purgatory and limbo "so that vast spiritual worlds were in travail over the close interpretation of a canonical provision". It was a world "full of legal traps" from which only God's mercy could rescue one. He added that Pope John then "turned everything topsy turvy with an insight that has proved to be so devastatingly correct" (1969:2).

Louise Fuller looked at the pre-conciliar era in Ireland when bishops "were very preoccupied with warning people about dangers to faith and morality", especially sexual morality, and feared threats to Irish Catholic culture coming from mainland Europe, an approach that was mainly reactive (2002:30).

Archbishop and priests

Antecedents brought to the relationship, and expectations of archbishop and priests within it, were based upon belief in the authority of the bishop and the duty of priests to give him absolute and uncritical obedience. New theological and social ideas were filtering into Ireland, but the expectation in 1959 was that there might be a gradual process of updating as had been seen

during the long pontificate of Pope Pius XII (1939-58), and that nothing would change suddenly.

Dublin diocesan priests were trained in Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, divided by a wall from Archbishop's House, Drumcondra. Some were sent for part of their studies to St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, or to overseas universities, usually in Rome or Louvain. Philosophy students attended University College, Dublin (UCD) for a three-year BA degree.

Stack remembers Clonliffe in the 1950s as "cold, formal, kind of alienating...". He does not believe McQuaid understood consultation, but priests didn't expect it because they had been formed in a "non-consultative culture". Father A remembers the regime as "archaic" and "very strict" without any attempt "to put you in touch with modern conditions" and criticises the theological teaching as "old scholastic style" and very much confined to textbooks. For students at UCD, "there was a rigid, strict rule, that you were not to speak to any lay student...".

Stack says it was "a much more formal time" with a great sense of "immutability" and ministers in government acted the same way as McQuaid, as did business firms, law firms, living in a "slightly Victorian age" where there was enormous reverence for authority...people were very conscious of the need to be obedient servants...".

Archbishop Diarmuid Martin of Dublin says Clonliffe was a "very difficult seminary" in the early 1960s, and "like a prison" with visits every second week. He found the rules very petty, especially in the beginning, and for the first three years "we had no music, no newspapers, no television"(RTE Radio 2003c). This was the way seminaries, on instructions from Rome, were organised in those days, as seen in numerous accounts, such as Küng (2002).

Battelle, ordained 1956, says he and several other younger priests did not expect much to happen: "We expected new definitions. We expected a new way of liturgy, but we never expected to spin into a completely new ethos of the priesthood and of the Church and of relationships between bishops and priests and people". Butler felt things would change slowly, but not through a Council: "We didn't know what to expect...Nor did the bishops...It was absolutely new territory."

Corish says some priests wondered what the Council could do, as all had already been defined by previous Councils and by the Pope. He believes some bishops were "hermetically sealed". Flannery found a feeling among a lot of Irish bishops and priests that "we have a winning team, why change it?" Greene saw nothing wrong with the Faith in Ireland at that time, "...and the place was redolent of religion...and the right thing to do. Then, like all Councils, its aftermaths produced quite a lot of problems that were not there in Ireland".

Archbishop and laity / priests and laity

Ireland in the 1950s was dominated by the twin issues of emigration and unemployment. For some (Keogh *et al*, 2004) it was the "lost decade"; for the laity, McQuaid was a remote, even invisible figure, but he had a strong, authoritarian "presence", and was believed to know and influence everything that was happening. Garvin (2004:56) refers to him as "a kind of ecclesiastical dictator of the Dublin archdiocese" who "dominated much of its civic as well as its religious life in a quite extraordinary way". Much has been written about the power of the Catholic bishops in Ireland and their role in the twin struggles for political and religious independence. Cooney refers to the "awesome power exercised by the Catholic Church in Ireland in the mid-twentieth century"(1999b:17) and the criticism that it seemed to be "the effective Government of the country"(1999b:271).

Interviewees used the term 'clericalism', for the Irish Church of the 1950s, meaning everything was still left to the clergy. The laity had little part to play in running the parish or church affairs and they were quite happy, their only duties being, as Bishop Primeau of Manchester, New Hampshire, USA said, disapprovingly, at Vatican II to "believe, pray, obey and pay"(Rynne 1964:111). De la Bedoyere typified the 'clericalist layman' as one who believes that only the priest can do real Christian work, and he wants to help him (1954:6).

For Mac Réamoinn, what distinguished

“all the bishops from the rest of us...was a kind of remoteness ...they belonged to a slightly different world...And if there was any relationship between bishops and people...they were condescending somewhat...But it seems to be part of...what was expected...that along with the mitre ...you were put on a slightly different level and people would kiss your hand”.

Louis McRedmond remembers the respect laity had for clergy and the “awe of bishops” that was built into them: “It wasn’t a fear thing, it wasn’t an imposition...this was what the Irish Catholic Church was about”. He agrees it was a “culture”, the bishops “came out of these people and this is what people expected of bishops, that they would conduct themselves like bishops...”

Fitz-Patrick says the parish clergy’s seminary training “basically perpetuated this old, awful thing of the parish priest being a kind of martinet, totally on a pedestal, and totally removed from reality and especially the reality of the ordinary-day life of the Catholic”. Fitz-Patrick felt it strange that priests who “were ordained to preach and evangelise” spent so much time at tasks that the laity could do equally well or better, such as discussing insurance and security. Battelle found the laity “very conservative” and “quite happy to let the priests handle the Church”.

Ward says one cannot know what the Irish people expected from the Council nor to what extent they were ready for it: "This was in the days before surveys. So, we just don't know". He accepts, however, that the Irish people's response to the changes as they came over the next few years, would suggest that they "probably" were ready. Elizabeth Lovatt-Dolan experienced "a great bubbling, a kind of enthusiasm, that things are going to be different, lay people are going to be taken seriously, and they are going to be included in decision-making". Joseph F. Foyle holds that "even John XXIII himself didn't know what he was walking into" and that the bishops thought it would be a "cakewalk". Mac Réamoinn agrees certain bishops thought the Council would be over "very quickly, perhaps in one session."

PREPARING DUBLIN FOR THE COUNCIL

Leo McAuley, Irish Ambassador to the Holy See, reported (12/3/60) that in Rome it was different now from the original excitement aroused by the announcement of the Council: "Perhaps people no longer expect a great deal from the Council, certainly not any long step towards reconciliation with the Orthodox Church". McAuley believed "the liberal atmosphere clothing the original project has been dissipated" and that it could "all be over in a single session"(Ar-16). Murray, then a student in Maynooth, remembers

"somebody saying to me that the big thing that seemed to require consideration, as far as the faculty in Maynooth was concerned, was the interpretation of servile work...[Fr. P.F.] Frank Cremin, God rest

him, he thought the biggest problem was servile work which was a whole half of a Commandment which was not clear".

Cremin told McQuaid (12/4/60) he was "rounding off for the Commission of the Council a Studium on the law of abstaining from servile work", and he thanked McQuaid for "a learned contribution" that he had sent to him with an outline of theological topics (Ar-64).

Signs of new thinking in parts of the European Church in the 1950s were not always as evident as they seemed in retrospect. Michael Gill refers to countries like Germany and Holland where, for example, liturgical renewal pre-dated the Council by maybe ten years. Gill wonders was the Council cause or effect:

"I think it was an effect of what was happening anyway...an awful lot was going on philosophically, and the same thing was coming through theologically, and inevitably you had somebody of great sensitivity like John XXIII who said, 'Let's do something about this'".

MacMahon, studying in Rome during the 1950s, did not see much sign of movements of thought: "Pope Pius XII had opened up things a bit, in the liturgy of Holy Week, for example...but Pope Pius XII was a bit worried by some of these ideas that were developing". MacMahon refers to Pius' encyclical, *Humani Generis* (1950), which was a reaction to the new thinking, "but that is the usual reaction, I think, the reaction of caution, the reaction of what possible dangerous directions could this take".

McQuaid's pre-Council submission

For MacMahon the only indication as to what would come up at the Council was the questionnaire sent out by the Central Committee for the Preparation of the Council, "indicating various subjects to be treated of and there was nothing in those that would have indicated any very great change." All of the bishops in the world received this questionnaire and there were 30 responses from Ireland – 24 of the 26 residential bishops, Nuncio Riberi, two auxiliary bishops and three retired missionary bishops. Some submissions were brief, with McQuaid's three pages being the longest apart from the Nuncio and Bishop Eugene O'Callaghan of Clogher. The texts of all submissions were published by the Vatican (1960) but classified at that stage as "*sub secreto*".

McQuaid's response (24/8/59) considered the matters of greatest concern to be the union of the "separated brethren" with the Catholic Church and what the Church could do for world peace and to halt the progress of the nuclear arms race (Vatican 1960:77-80). The complete submission is in Appendix D (pp. 571-76).

McQuaid wanted a stronger affirmation of the Catholic position on original sin and its effects and he proposed condemnation of "modern errors" such as evolution, polygenism (multiple origins of mankind rather than the single parents, Adam & Eve), existentialism, socialism and communism, as well as "errors" in philosophy arising from linguistic analysis, logical positivism and theories of symbols. He wished for an infallible definition of the Blessed

Virgin Mary as Mediatrix of All Graces, wanted clarification on the power and authority of residential bishops in their dioceses. He was concerned about "situation ethics" and "moral rearmament", errors against Christian marriage, need for uniformity on interpretation of servile work which was forbidden on a Sunday, greater uniformity in Church "holydays of obligation" and modification of the laws of fast and abstinence.

He was also looking for revisions in the Code of Canon Law (1917), including clarification of the Bishop's role towards lay associations and members of religious orders who worked in the diocese. He stressed the importance of clergy visiting the homes in their parishes so that they could know their people and look after them. He wanted the Vatican to notify bishops of its actions and decisions before releasing them to the secular media. None of the interviewees, apart from Murray, on Cremin and servile work, referred to these submissions.

Preparatory commissions

The bishops' submissions were to assist the commissions set up in Rome to prepare documentation for discussion at the Council. Nuncio Riberi asked McQuaid (11/4/60) for suitable names of bishops and priests, "eminent for a holy life as well as for their exceptional and orthodox knowledge of philosophy, theology and canon law", who could be considered for membership of these commissions (Ar-20).

Minutes of the Irish Bishops' meetings make little, if any, reference to the Council in the lead-up to its opening. What seems the first reference was at the final meeting before the Council (19/6/62) when they issued a prayer for its success, urging priests to recite their Divine Office and laity to say the Rosary daily for this intention (Ar-10). Successive editions of the *Irish Catholic Directory* show the main thing the Bishops said to the people before and during the Council was to pray for its success, but they never asked them to submit views and ideas for consideration.

Theological training

Theological training of priests has been highlighted as a negative influence in preparation for the Council. Corish sees the pre-Council years as the "end of a long tradition which was beginning to suffer from rheumatism and affliction of the joints". He typifies that tradition as teaching theology from textbooks, leading to the belief that one could always be certain about everything. There was discussion but "it did not disturb the overall atmosphere of certainty". Father B says "the professor came in and he more or less translated the Latin textbook...Most of the guys didn't know a word of Latin anyhow...Terrible stuff". However, this had started to change. Father B, in Rome in the 1950s, became aware of the new theological thinking, and of theologians like Congar, de Lubac, Rahner and others, "who were influencing us". He returned to teach theology in Clonliffe College, "and it was absolutely marvellous."

Agents of change

Some interviewees, clerical and lay, raised spontaneously, and with enthusiasm, good influences that helped them to understand and implement the Council.

The Furrow and Doctrine & Life

Two monthly journals of religious and social content, *The Furrow* and *Doctrine & Life* were praised. *The Furrow*, from the national seminary at Maynooth, was edited by Canon Jerry McGarry. *Doctrine & Life*, edited from 1957 by Fr. Austin Flannery, was published by the Dominican order in Dublin. Stack, ordained 1959, sees *The Furrow* as being "the most significant single thing" that would have prepared him for the Council. He sees McGarry as "an extraordinary prophetic figure", personifying "the symbol of enlightenment, combined with common sense...". He also refers to McGarry managing "to publish things that on the face of it would seem to undermine the traditional hierarchical structure". For Griffin, McGarry was "a complete original". For Battelle, *The Furrow*, in particular, "began to sow new ideas and also some ideas we mightn't have been too happy with...". Patrick Masterson says *The Furrow* was coming through with a lot of views, and the new ideas "began to find a more popular outlet". Mac Réamoinn says the new priests emerging around and after the time of the Council were not just the products of Maynooth but of *The Furrow*. Lovatt-Dolan believes both journals were "immensely influential, but for a relatively small group of readers." Mac Réamoinn says the Irish response to the Council came entirely through journals such as these. Dublin diocesan priests did not

write much for *The Furrow* and *Doctrine & Life*. One reason may have been anxiety about the diocesan censor, as pointed out by Griffin. Flannery says when he was appointed editor of *Doctrine & Life*, "my Provincial Superior got a letter from John Charles saying this was OK but, 'I hope he will be very careful about articles dealing with liturgy or education', and 'so far we have been spared the Dialogue Mass...'"

Fuller believes both clergy and people would have been "considerably disturbed by, and less prepared for, the profound changes instigated by the conciliar reforms" were it not for *The Furrow* and *Doctrine & Life* (2002:108). Mgr. Michael Olden, reviewing Fuller's book in *The Furrow*, says *The Furrow* "did much to prepare the soil" for Vatican II and when the call to change came "there was a degree of readiness to respond" (2003:243).

The Group

An informal group, mainly of lay people, used come together in Dublin with Austin Flannery for small discussion sessions. Some referred to them as Flannery's Harriers. Flannery says it arose from his friendship with Jack Dowling, a broadcaster and journalist:

"...Jack was very keen to have theological discussions and I felt I couldn't cope with Jack without help. Gradually that grew into the idea of having a group, not a group with a priest in charge, but a group of lay people and priests...We got people talking on subjects that John Charles wouldn't have liked...There was very little theological discussion in Ireland, very little. And the result was when

the bishops went to Rome they were ill-prepared...and some of the things that were said came as a hell of a shock."

Joe Fitz-Patrick says meetings of The Group kept him "sane and alive" so he could "meet with Catholic intellectuals, discuss current affairs, that maybe things might change". Masterson went occasionally and it would be "a ferment for theological discussion". It was reported to Flannery that McQuaid said: "I believe Fr. Flannery has a salon in my diocese" but there was no further reaction. "He never wrote to us nor said anything at all", adds Flannery.

Milltown Park public lectures

Series of public lectures were held at the Jesuit College, Milltown Park, Dublin every spring and winter from 1960 to 1969 inclusive. Fr. Michael Hurley, the organiser, says they were "highly significant" in educating the laity: "Their success in attracting audiences clearly indicated they met a need". Griffin points to their popularity: "There was a tremendous interest in prayer at that time after Vatican II". Hurley has compiled the list of topics, speakers and dates for all of the 146 lectures. Jesuits gave 116 of them, with four by Dublin diocesan priests – John M.Nolan of UCD twice, Feichín O'Doherty, also UCD, and Liam Breen, a curate – and nine by lay men and women (1998:341-7).

Glenstal liturgical congresses

Liturgical congresses were organised annually for 21 years by the Benedictine monks at Glenstal, Co. Limerick, before, during and after the Council, with a large attendance of clergy and some laity. Griffin adds this to McGarry and Flannery as the third factor which "saved the Irish Church". McQuaid probably had reservations, as indicated when Burke Savage (6/11/65) submitted a list of proposed lecturers for a Unity Week series and Joseph Dowdall, Abbot of Glenstal, was one of the names rejected (Ar-79).

Dublin diocesan outreach lectures

From the 1950s there was an annual programme of lectures for adults, in co-ordination with adult education boards and vocational education committees throughout the archdiocese. Fr. Seán Fagan, Father B and Fr. Hurley were on the panel of lecturers. Lay volunteers, Knights of St. Columbanus, drove the lecturers to the schools (Ar-80). Hurley says the lectures were an initiative of Mgr. Fehily, Director of the Dublin Institute of Catholic Sociology, with the encouragement of McQuaid: "He certainly knew about them and allowed them". Fagan admires [McQuaid's] concern for adult education, with lay involvement, "because he used lay groups and there was little in the way of funding, nothing at all. The drivers and lecturers gave their services free". Father B says McQuaid wanted the laity to be educated about the Council, but some of the older priests were not so supportive. The outreach lectures continued through and after the Council. The programme for 1965/66, for example, included numerous updates on the Council and there were several lay lecturers (Ar-37). Fr. Liam Breen,

treasurer, told McQuaid (9/6/67) that in the 1966 season there were 136 lectures, covering 121 centres with an average attendance of 20 and very good discussion (Ar-24).

Patrician Year 1961

The 1500th anniversary of the death of St. Patrick was celebrated in 1961. National ceremonies were held in Armagh, in March, with Cardinal James McIntyre as Papal Delegate. In June, McQuaid held a week-long Patrician Congress in Dublin, also favoured with a Papal Delegate, Cardinal Gregory Agagianian, and culminating with Mass in Croke Park before as big an attendance as ever attended a gaelic football or hurling match there. McQuaid and Agagianian were driven around the ground in an open-top limousine blessing the cheering crowd. There is evidence that McQuaid and Agagianian did not like each other. Auxiliary Bishop Dunne wrote to McQuaid (28/2/61): "They say that Cardinal Agagianian is somewhat inscrutable, incommunicative, but always charming. But Your Grace's labour will not be lightened by his coming". McQuaid's note (1/3/61): "Thank you. I never sought the honour. Honour it is, but a great worry" (Ar-7).

Fehily was Congress Director, and this was the only interview in which the Patrician Year was raised, and that was because of the Congress Volunteer Corps, a group of schoolboys who were brought together for stewarding duties. Archbishop Diarmuid Martin was one of them. Fehily says there were two hundred of them in uniform and when it was decided to disband

them after the Congress, the Taoiseach, Seán Lemass, urged McQuaid to keep them on because there was no youth movement of that calibre of education. They have remained as a social work organisation now known as the Colleges Volunteer Corps.

Feeney considered the Congress as a "glittering bejewelled spectacle of Catholic life just before the Council", before the realities of the Church impinged too strongly on Ireland (1974:41). Fergal Tobin regarded it as "the most public manifestation" of Dublin's Catholicism since the Eucharistic Congress of 1932, claiming that no Protestant churchmen were invited to participate in any of the events. Deirdre McMahon saw it as "the apotheosis" of McQuaid's episcopate and of "the Tridentine, post-Cullenite Church in which he had lived most of his life" (2000:371).

RADHARC TELEVISION DOCUMENTARIES

McQuaid agreed (16/3/59) to send two Dublin priests, Fr. Joe Dunn and Fr. Desmond Forristal, to a television course in Manchester, run by Fr. Agnellus Andrew for ABC (TV), and taken by all BBC producers. Only Dunn was accepted as places were limited (Ar-26). Canon Cathal McCarthy, President, Clonliffe College, and McQuaid's adviser on broadcasting, then heard from Fehily at DICS about a course for Radio and TV at the Academy of Broadcasting Arts, New York, and wrote to Fr. Liam Martin, McQuaid's secretary (30/7/59): "I do think that we have no time to spare in equipping a priest or better two priests for television"(Ar-26). McQuaid acted

promptly, sending Dunn and Forristal on the three-month course and paying their expenses. When McQuaid received their report (22/1/60), he noted: "Thank you. What I sought. Clear, well-ordered, completed, 25/1/60"(Ar-26).

This led to the Radharc television film unit, which made documentaries on religious and social topics in Ireland and around the world. McQuaid supported the project, financed it and released Dunn , Forristal and other priests to work on it. They sold their work to the newly-established Irish television station, Telefis Eireann, now RTE, and they made 400 films in 35 years, the longest-running programme of its type in the history of the station.

The Radharc story is told in the late Joe Dunn's three books (1986, 1994 and 1996). Whether it was McQuaid himself, or Cathal McCarthy, or Dunn, or Fehily, who first had the idea, McQuaid backed it fully and did not interfere with topics or content of programmes. The correspondence reflects well on McQuaid.

Dunn told McQuaid (6/12/63):

Two days before Your Grace returned from Rome, our little Programme 'Radharc' received the Jacobs Award for most enterprising programme on Telefis Eireann in competition with Broadsheet and the Late Late Show. Roughly 400,000 people now watch each programme.

McQuaid (10/12/63) noted telling Dunn that Radharc was now a Dublin unit, independent of TE, of the Central Catholic Advisory Committee and of Father Romuald Dodd, Director of Religious Programmes, but "subject to me and in religious matters to my liaison officer, Canon McCarthy. Gave £500 for an editing machine".

Dunn told McQuaid (16/1/64) there were long delays before terms were agreed for the coming season, partly because of TE's "obvious anxiety that we work through Fr. Dodd, and my determination not to". McQuaid congratulated Dunn on his stand and told him "to stand clear from Father Dodd, OP. You are not a 'religious' programme, and you are subject directly to me in your work"(Ar-26).

When McQuaid bought a new camera for Radharc, Dunn replied (27/4/67):

Your Grace's last letter left me, not only ruminating, but speechless! What am I to say? I have spent ten minutes looking out the window for some expression of thanks which doesn't sound vulgar or trite. I have failed to find anything which sounds better than the simple, 'Thank you'. Penny coloured, tuppence plain (Ar-26).

But things were to change. By 1970, Radharc was nearly completely run by lay people, with Forristal and Dermod McCarthy the only priests remaining. Dunn was now in charge of the Communications Centre and the new Catholic Communications Institute, working under Archbishop Tom Morris of Cashel & Emly. Radharc had an influential critic in Mgr. Barrett and

McQuaid's enthusiasm was diminishing. Barrett wrote to McQuaid (19/11/69) fearing that Radharc might suffer from Dunn being so involved in his new appointment:

Recent Radharc programmes have not been so impressive. They may have been excellent technically, but this isn't enough. They must not drift away from their primary purpose viz to publicise the Church in a positive manner (Ar-26).

Barrett felt "both Radharc and the Communications Centre are going to suffer if Father Dunn has to pull out...They [Dunn and Morris] seem to be drifting without a compass; if they are not careful, they will find themselves on the Rocks"(Ar-26). McQuaid informed Dunn of Barrett's criticism of the programme, *Eggs in the Hay*, on popular Irish superstitions, and Dunn did not defend it (21/10/69):

"It would be wrong for me to disclaim responsibility for last Sunday's programme and I won't therefore attempt it. I didn't like the programme much either...In the memorandum which I sent to Your Grace last Sunday, I gave as one of the reasons for perhaps giving Father Forristal more completely to the operation of Radharc would be 'to exercise a more effective control over Father McCarthy and the two lay editors'. Earlier on the same page I refer more explicitly to lack of judgement"(Ar-26).

Nine months later, Dermot McCarthy was removed from Radharc and appointed to Athy parish as curate. He said (25/5/05, conversation) he did not know about Barrett and Dunn's criticism of the superstitions

programme but had believed it was two programmes on nuns that had caused McQuaid to move him. McCarthy says the programmes on the position of nuns after Vatican II, made with Fr. John Wall, who was also moved to another parish soon afterwards, showed that the reforms were not being implemented and that nuns felt greatly frustrated. Barrett, parish priest in Booterstown, the parish where the Radharc unit was based, intervened with the sister principal of a local convent school after he heard that shooting for the programmes had started and had been done, with her permission, in her school. The Radharc people were "thrown out" and they eventually made the programmes with other religious-run schools in different parishes and dioceses. It is significant that despite knowing about the programmes, McQuaid did not intervene or stop them being broadcast.

Dermod McCarthy praises Radharc as "one of the most enlightened initiatives of John Charles' time...And he didn't think it would work, but he was prepared to go along with it..." When McCarthy was moved to Athy, Forristal (4/7/70) asked McQuaid to reconsider the appointment, saying he would now be the only priest regularly in Radharc and that McCarthy's move would make "things difficult for the time being". McQuaid replied (7/7/70) that it would not be possible "to change, or postpone" McCarthy's appointment, adding, "from your description of his work, there would seem to be nothing in it that calls for the presence of a priest"(Ar-26). Dunn replied to McQuaid (10/7/70) that he "naturally" regretted the loss of another priest in a relatively short period (Ar-26).

Stack, once a member of the team, says "Radharc was able to, in a subtle way and perhaps not even totally consciously, say things to the Irish church about the Irish church through the medium of the churches abroad...". Others also praise McQuaid for the Radharc initiative: Father B: "... in many ways hugely enlightened"; Connell: "... a man of great foresight"; Masterson: "...and these people, they were not safe men, Joe Dunn was a very independent spirit"; Mac Réamoinn: "...ahead of any of his colleagues"; Horgan: "The richness of the Radharc heritage is unbelievable"; Murray: "...He saw that television was coming and you had to be up there..."; Gill: "...one of the great, good influences where he [McQuaid] was forward and looking ahead"; Griffin: "...a big plus for him"; MacMahon: "... a very positive development..."; Lovatt-Dolan: "Radharc opened all kinds of doors to all kinds of people...opening windows, because we were very enclosed and we were very much into the model of the Church triumphant...". Foyle makes the only negative comment: "Their programmes have been totally ineffective; after all, they failed to stop Catholic free fall. They are museum pieces".

6: VATICAN II – DISSEMINATION, 1962-1965

THIS CHAPTER covers the four sessions of the Council in the autumns of 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965. The bishops of the Catholic Church came to Rome and debated and expressed their differences in a way which surprised many people. McQuaid is shown as extremely diligent, but at first shocked by what was happening, never at ease with it, worried about what he saw as challenges to orthodox doctrine and the authority of the Pope, and then accepting it loyally as the work of the Holy Spirit within his Church. He voted in favour of the documents and implemented and communicated certain measures ahead of many of his fellow-bishops. The media are seen not to have made the Council into an issue but to have moved it along and, with the co-operation of liberal bishops and advisers, broken down the secrecy which the Roman Curia had imposed upon the proceedings. They thus created, for the first time, a transparency and an accountability in the central governing authority of the Church and this eventually percolated down to local level.

THE FOUR SESSIONS

McQuaid's expectation at the start of the Council was consistent with the "no change" message that he brought home at the end, and with his views on ecumenism. He hoped, in a letter his priests (27/9/62), that

...The Faithful will be careful not to expect from the Council what in the plan of God it is not meant to achieve. They will guard against undue expectation of new definitions of doctrine, new laws of discipline, new or startling movements towards the unity of Christendom...We hope that God, in his mercy, may incline the hearts of those who live separated from us in doctrine and discipline to turn towards the only Truth...If it should please the Council to issue new laws concerning the discipline of Catholic life, we will accept the decrees and loyally execute the commands of the Holy Father and the Council"(Ar-65).

Irish bishops at the Council

The first session, October-December 1962, established patterns for the remaining sessions, with bishops rejecting the Roman Curia's selections of chairmen for the meetings and amending, even rejecting, documents presented by the Curia for discussion. Many views of these bishops were adopted finally as majority views. McQuaid tended to be sympathetic to curial viewpoints. He was most active in the first session, leading the Irish bishops, because John Cardinal D'Alton, Chairman of the Irish Episcopal Conference, was terminally ill. McQuaid made two of his three contributions to the Council debates during the first session. D'Alton died in February 1963 and William Conway, his successor as Archbishop of Armagh, was Chairman for the remaining sessions.

McQuaid agreed to a meeting of Irish bishops with their English and Scottish counterparts (3/11/62), at which Cardinal Godfrey of Westminster said the purpose was "to suggest means by which the business of the

Council could be accelerated". A sub-committee, with McQuaid as chairman, and a further meeting, led to an agreed proposal, influenced by Bishop Michael Browne of Galway, calling for even greater media secrecy. It requested a drastic reduction of schemata, so as "to present to the Fathers only what is of vital interest to the Council". The Irish Hierarchy agreed to continue consultation and collaboration. McQuaid seems to have dominated these proceedings and studied the documentation with his usual diligence. Agreed points were sent to Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, for the Council's consideration. McQuaid told Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles (5/11/62) that the Irish bishops would retain their independent position, while maintaining contact with the British hierarchy (Ar-68).

McQuaid, early 1963, suggested a series of expert lectures for the bishops, but there was opposition. The lectures were postponed and seem not have taken place. McQuaid, however, asked Jesuits Fr. Kevin Smyth and Fr. M.A.O'Grady, two of the proposed lecturers, to help him personally by preparing exactly what he had asked (23/2/63): "Your papers will be of great benefit to me when the schemata come back to me in a few weeks. I shall, I hope, see you both again"(Ar-74).

Smyth was to prepare an outline of Middle European theology. This indicates that McQuaid wished to take advice on Council issues before replying to Rome and he was trying to understand trends in Europe and the work of Rahner, Küng and others, which were a source of controversy at the

first session. Also, he probably realised that the other Irish bishops were not well-informed.

The Irish Hierarchy met together in Rome during the Council sessions. A committee to discuss the 'problem' of the vernacular [local languages instead of Latin] in the Liturgy reported (3/11/63) they were reluctant to change and would prefer only to do so if they had to. It proposed they all move together on changes and maintain uniformity throughout the country. It seemed to them that the proposed *Constitution on the Liturgy* imposed no "juridical obligation" to introduce the vernacular, "...if left to ourselves, we would in all probability prefer the status quo". They made a case to hold out against the vernacular until all of the reforms were complete, rather than have piecemeal changes over a period of years which "will tend to confuse the ordinary faithful and dispose them to regard nothing in faith, morals, or discipline as outside the possibility of change"(Ar-10).

Father A recalls his "excitement" as a student in Rome during the Council, attending meetings with journalists and liberal bishops and theologians who had become media celebrities. McQuaid never enquired but Father A thinks he "disapproved immensely of all this stuff". Horgan says Irish diocesan bishops were "not great mixers" at the Council and seemed to go straight back to the Irish College after the day's debates. Griffin says the Irish bishops were taken by surprise at the Council, that "they hadn't a clue" and sent for Fr. Cahal Daly, not then a bishop, "to enlighten them".

The Government was interested. During the second session (12/11/63), Hugh McCann, Secretary, Department of External Affairs, wrote to Tommy Commins, Irish Ambassador to the Holy See, that the Minister [Frank Aiken]

has indicated a wish to have any available information about what is happening at the current session of the Ecumenical Council and, in particular, the general attitude of the Irish bishops and the main problems. I understand that the President [Eamon de Valera] and others have been talking to him in the matter (Ar-2).

Commings reported back that the Irish bishops "taken as a body or individually, with one or two notable exceptions, are a completely closed book". He said that even in relaxed gatherings like lunch "they are not forthcoming in any positive way in expressing constructive views on the matters being dealt with in the Council..."

Commings' next paragraph, "top secret" says

Even the Irish Periti [theological advisers] such as, e.g. Msgr Herlihy and Father Cremin who are in day to day and, indeed, one might say, hour to hour contact with the Bishops and on whose expertise the Bishops one would think would be anxious to draw, are I know never consulted by the body of Bishops and are not in fact permitted to be present at any meetings which the Bishops hold in the Irish College for the discussion of Council matters (Ar-2).

Commins says this "reflects an oyster-like and thus far completely impenetrable characteristic of the Irish Hierarchy" adding that

it has always been evident that their whole attitude to the Council itself has been the reverse of exuberant and the only thing which one can deduce with certain from contact with them, is that their first reaction to any given problem within the Council will be supremely conservative. A notable exception, and as far as I can see, the only one, is Bishop Philbin of Down and Connor...(Ar-2).

Commins reported, "highly confidential" (29/7/64), that there was "little indication" that the [Irish] Hierarchy as a body or as individuals, had moved from the "rather supine and reserved approach to the Council and Council problems which has characterised their participation in the last two sessions"(Ar-2).

Answering Coogan's queries (which were not sent back to Coogan) as to whether the Irish people were impressed or unimpressed with the showing or contribution of the Hierarchy at the Council, McQuaid, with MacMahon and Dowling, said it was "difficult to say" short of something like a survey. Some of the books on the Council had attempted an estimate, but it was "hard to say how far they influenced public opinion". And, in (apparently) Dowling's handwriting:

It would be quite wrong to suggest that the Council was composed of rival hierarchies engaged in capping one another's contributions, but

in fact the quality of the scholastic and theological thought brought to the Council reflected great credit on this country (Ar-32).

Archbishop Morris of Cashel & Emly, in a 1992 interview, sensitive portions of which were published only after his death, recalled he had been a bishop for two years when the Council started and was "quite insular" in his outlook on the Church and his theology. He "didn't know what sort of issues were likely to come up in Rome" but that he had heard of a pastoral letter issued by the bishops of Holland. McQuaid had told him about it, regarding it as "too advanced, unorthodox", but he himself "didn't know about the cleavages within the theology schools"(K.Wood 1997).

McQUAID AT THE COUNCIL

Mgr. MacMahon and Mgr. Michael O'Connell were McQuaid's secretaries at the Council. MacMahon confirms that McQuaid was present at all of the debates and kept in closest touch with the English, Australian and New Zealand hierarchies. MacMahon says McQuaid never discussed with him "what one might call the *übeblick*, or the overview of the Council as such; maybe, some individual parts, but not the whole lot". Fehily was in Rome for one week during the second session, "for the experience", and he recalls that McQuaid "examined the texts very carefully. He spent all his time in the evenings studying them".

McQuaid was aware of his low profile at the Council and told Burke Savage (14/5/66): "I lived as a hermit in Rome..."(Ar-79). Correspondence shows,

however, that McQuaid met other bishops and moved about more than has been supposed. He received many invitations to functions, most of which he turned down, preferring those that were directly related to the Council rather than social events (Ar-69).

Interviewees refer to McQuaid's pleasure at the precedence he was given, as Archbishop of Dublin, in the Council seating arrangements. He was described as "*Primas I*" and seated next to the cardinals because he was the senior primate of a country. MacMahon: "That made it nice for him"; John Brophy: "He wasn't a cardinal but was the next best thing"; Father A: "He was certainly one of the top people there...". He later showed Gallagher a bound volume of the Council proceedings where he was listed, "the first metropolitan of the universal Church, the leading primate".

Louis McRedmond believes McQuaid became more and more isolated because of the consistency of his views, which were unpopular and seen as supporting the curial minority. McRedmond admires him for his consistency, while not agreeing with him, and compares him favourably against some of the other Irish bishops.

What McQuaid said at the Council

Two of McQuaid's interventions, on behalf of the Irish Hierarchy, were on The Liturgy, during the first session (24/10/62 and 30/10/62). He surrendered his right to speak on The Church (7/11/62). His intervention in

the Ecumenism debate, during the second session (19/11/63), was on his own behalf. MacMahon says McQuaid's contributions to the debates were "brief and to the point, and in very good Latin". The archives contain handwritten drafts of some of McQuaid's interventions and written submissions on matters circulated to the bishops between sessions. McQuaid studied every document and circular with care and was meticulous in the wording of his submissions. See Appendix D (p. 571-83) for full Latin texts of McQuaid's interventions.

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy

McQuaid addressed the Council (24/10/62) on Chapter 1 of the Liturgy document (97 words). He referred to Pope Pius XII's Encyclical *Mediator Dei* (1947) and its emphasis on the active participation of the people in the Mass and on the Mass as a sacrifice and suggested that all of the Irish bishops wanted an added paragraph to this effect (Vatican 1970a:414).

Rynne reported McQuaid saying he wanted the Latin language retained in the Mass but could see the utility of allowing the vernacular in the administration of the Sacraments (1963:108). There is no reference to Latin or the vernacular in the published version.

McQuaid spoke again on behalf of the Irish bishops (30/10/62) on Chapter 2 of the Liturgy document (214 words). He said that "pastors of souls should take care that the Faithful acknowledge the sacrifice of the Mass as the centre of their religious life". The Irish bishops were not in favour of

communion under both species of bread and wine, even in special cases, and they preferred the Tridentine discipline to be "religiously observed". On the question of extending the practice of concelebrated Masses, with many priests saying the one Mass, the Irish bishops "are of the opinion that the reason which would make desirable its extension is not verified in our country". They believed the people were happier having several Masses celebrated at the one time on different altars (Vatican 1970b:44).

Bishop Edward Joyce (New Zealand) rang McQuaid at the Irish College (30/10/62) and MacMahon wrote McQuaid a note that Joyce said a number of the Fathers had spoken to him

of Your Grace's intervention in the discussion on Chapter 2 of the liturgical scheme today. Cardinal Gilroy [Australia] was very pleased, considering the presentation clear and concise, and he would fully agree with the content. Cardinal D'Alton has spoken highly of the intervention. (Ar-66).

Rynne refers to some speakers on 30/10/62 being against innovation in the liturgy, while others were favourable to the schema generally but felt there was room for certain modifications and reservations: "...Archbishop McQuaid of Dublin came out once more against any thought of change"(1963:118).

Decree on Ecumenism

McQuaid addressed the Council (19/11/63) on the Ecumenism document (118 words) (Vatican 1973:566). He said:

"The document on Ecumenism is in general acceptable; insofar as sound doctrine is concerned there are many matters extremely well expressed.

"I should, however, like, with due respect, to add just this.

"Experience has shown that very many, including highly educated catholics, tend to confuse certain sincere, benevolent expressions on the part of non-catholics in relation to the Church with an intention of mind and heart of accepting the entire doctrine of the Church.

"We bishops, however, long versed over many years in dealing with newly converted non-catholics, have learned from experience rather than books. We have discovered that converts who accept the catholic faith wish, in the last analysis, to understand specifically the catholic doctrine set out, not nebulously but precisely, a doctrine that is not simply the speculations of private theologians, but as set out in serene and pastoral terms by the Holy Roman See".

There is also text of a more critical written submission from McQuaid on a draft of Chapter 2, par. 7 of the *Decree of Ecumenism*. It was possibly a response to a Curia request for comments. It is very critical of certain new ecumenical approaches:

"It is clear that simple Faithful who were brought up on the old catechesis, and abhorred heresy from their infancy, would find it very difficult, if not impossible to understand how today it could be possible to have common prayer with heretics, without at the same time lawfully assisting at their rites of marriage and funerals".

In another extract from the same submission, McQuaid believes "it would require a very lengthy process of preparation to prevent scandal and even damage to the Faith arising"(Ar-72).

McQuaid also expressed to Mgr Staffa in the Curia (6/10/64) his concern about the ecumenism decree. This was clearly submitted in response to a circulated document. Chapter 2, paragraph 8 was a "grave worry": "It is altogether repugnant to me". This paragraph in the final document refers to common prayer and, on special occasions, common worship with non-Catholics. He wanted the entire paragraph changed so that it would be clearly explained to the Faithful how such sharing could be lawful in relation to their presence at the administration and reception of the Sacraments (Ar-72).

One interpretation of the Staffa letter was that he "disagreed in principle" with the draft text (Cooney 1999b:366). That was not so, as shown in his address of 19/11/63, but he opposed those parts which seemed to go against all of his nature, especially the matter of joint prayer services with Protestants. His bewilderment was expressed earlier to Burke Savage (14/3/64): "I suppose we may as well close down the Catholic Enquiry

Centre, since Protestants 'do not need to be converted to God in Christ'"(Ar-79).

Dogmatic Constitution on the Church

McQuaid ceded his place as a speaker on Chapter 4 of the document on the Church (7/11/62) and left it as a written submission, an "*animadversio scripta*" (276 words) (Vatican 1972:260). This chapter refers to the vocation to sanctity in the Church. McQuaid was keen to stress that the Church was not just the clergy and those in religious orders and congregations but the entire membership. All were equally called to sanctity and it was possible for them to achieve it – fathers, mothers, families.

Declaration on Religious Freedom

McQuaid did not contribute publicly to debates about the document on Religious Freedom but his undated notes show he feared "inevitable misunderstandings especially among the ordinary Faithful" and commented that

more emphasis should be placed on the rights of God the creator. The schema is chiefly concerned with the so-called rights of the creature. Right cannot be based on the private judgement of individuals. Erroneous conscience confers no right to perform what it commands (Ar-77).

In another undated document McQuaid commented on specific sections of the Religious Freedom draft. He believed that the words "except when the

exercise of religion might injure public order" might '*prima facie*' be understood by communist states "to their own advantage to justify coercive action against the Catholic religion". He suggested the text be rephrased "so that the implications of the words "public order" and particularly the "common good" be more clear and he added: "The exercise of true religion can in no way injure the objective common good".

He accepted that the Document seemed founded on human dignity, but "human dignity as a current expression is far from clear and requires to be explained". He suggested the text be amplified "so as to demonstrate that human dignity is founded on the excellence of man in relation to created things as well as on the Natural Law and an intelligence and will as well as being derived from Divine Grace"(Ar-72).

The Council as an issue for McQuaid

McQuaid faced many issues together, so what priority did he, or could he, give to the Council? MacMahon believes it was an important issue for McQuaid "at the time and also for the five years or so that were left to him after the Council". Murray agrees it was an issue among others, but a major one. Fehily "supposes" it was the biggest issue for McQuaid. Stack says it would have to have been number one issue for every bishop because "they spent four years going and coming from Rome", and in particular for McQuaid because he always insisted on doing everything correctly. "I think it would be very hard for a churchman to avoid realising that the Council was a watershed"(Stack). Greene doesn't think it would have been such a

big issue, admitting that his own viewpoint at the time was “why do we need a Council?”.

McQuaid’s friendship with the Church of Ireland Archbishop of Dublin, George Otto Simms, shows he respected the Council and was keen to spread its message, and he saw it as important in his own life and the life of the Church. McQuaid gave gifts to Simms of each volume of the books on the Council (in French) by Fr. Antoine Wenger as they were published (Ar-8). Wenger, editor-in-chief of the French paper, *La Croix*, was a diligent and respected reporter at the Council. McQuaid also gave Simms the full set of Council documents (Ar-8).

Dom Christopher Butler, OSB, Abbot of Downside reviewing Wenger’s first volume, said it was “a balanced and thoughtful account by one who is aware of the theological implications of the matters discussed”. He criticised it, however, for being “if possible, too balanced and ‘irenic’”. He believed Wenger had equal sympathy for the ‘progressives’ and ‘reactionaries’ but the pages failed to convey “to one who was not present at the fateful debates the passion of the drama that was being enacted in them”(*The Tablet*, 31/8/63).

While McQuaid concentrated on the Council, he handled his daily correspondence from Rome and dealt promptly with other issues, especially developments in Irish television. Hierarchy minutes for 1963 reveal McQuaid’s close interest in the Government proposal to set up

comprehensive schools, while the Adoption Bill was another concern (Ar-10). Mgr. John O'Regan, Chancellor of the Diocese, and the secretaries, were in constant contact with McQuaid during the Council sessions. The reform of the Irish Episcopal Commissions in 1969 showed McQuaid's special interests, as he opted to sit on the commissions for universities, religious, pastoral care/emigrants (Ar-12).

McQuaid's attitude to the Council

Fr. Chris Mangan, secretary from 1941 to 1957, said McQuaid found the Council "difficult", unlike some bishops who adapted well to it (Kirby 1990:319). This is seen from his reaction to another phone call from Bishop Joyce, which MacMahon took at the Irish College (15/11/62) and noted:

"Bishop Joyce for the Archbishop of Dublin, 8.05 pm.

Bishop Joyce said the Anti-Curialist group were very active to-day, especially among the Africans, saying that they have the support of the Pope. Cardinal Gilroy, he said, was worried at this development.

McQuaid's insert: "This is only one of the alarms to which we shall be subjected all through the Council. And it will get worse".

The bishop then asked if Your Grace were speaking tomorrow. I said I did not know of anything that would indicate that Your Grace was, but that Your Grace might or might not be speaking – I did not know.

McQuaid's note at end: "No. I am not speaking. The issue is not at all clear yet. The Irish bishops have not formulated an unanimous opinion"(Ar-66).

Joyce, of Irish ancestry, visited McQuaid in Dublin before both the first and second sessions of the Council. He died aged 59, in January 1964, soon after returning from the second session (Ar-66).

McQuaid's Pastoral, *Second Vatican Council – First Session*, March 1963, was an early reflection on the Council and indicated he might be coming to terms with the differences of opinion and accepting the changes to come:

"But as must occur in every Council of the Church, each is not at one with all his fellow bishops in at once accepting this or that way of presenting the truth as fully suited to the needs of the existing world...From the necessary diversity of emphasis and phrasing in the Council will yet result such statement of the unchanging truth, such modification of law and discipline as, for our times and for coming generations, will show forth to men of good-will, in unsuspected beauty, the glory of the Church of Christ."

He showed openness in appointing members of the Public Image Committee (31/12/63) to "gather evidence as to the 'public image' or 'impact' of the Church in Dublin and consider means of improving that 'image' with a view to strengthening the Faith". He was ready to see where change was needed, but it would be gradual, and, at the first meeting (24/1/64) it was reported: "That there is a change, His Grace said, we will all agree, but not a revolution"(Ar-61).

McQuaid's Council correspondence tended to be with conservatives. He commiserated with Mgr. Parente of the Holy Office (8/11/63):

I am grieved by the immoderate utterances in respect of the Curia Romana. One might hope that Bishops, who are themselves *iudices*, would prove more judicial in the expression of their judgements. But I expect that a certain propaganda has succeeded in clouding the sense of justice in men who are otherwise admirable (Ar-75).

McQuaid expressed similar concern to the Public Image Committee (24/1/64), as reported:

The Vatican Council has stimulated criticism which is ignorant. In his book, *Struggle of Minds*, Schillebeeckx [1963] shows himself to be inaccurate and unfair. The man whom His Grace found to be fair, Wenger, has not been made available in English (Ar-61).

Interviewees indicate mixed views on McQuaid's attitude to the Council. He told Gill at the Irish College he had "grave reservations about what was happening in the Council, that it was something that would pass very, very quickly..."; Stack: McQuaid was "very cautious and his instinct would have been resistant to a lot of it"; Greene: "...a bit mixed. It wasn't very favourable, we would have thought..."; Gaughan: "...I would say he was not keen on the Council at all".

Louis McRedmond has no doubt McQuaid "wasn't really happy with the whole conciliar exercise", because people were going to be disturbed and

that was why he had to assure them. Masterson believes McQuaid "must have been a bit alarmed" at the scale of what was going on in the Church.

A pastoral letter from Bishop Philbin, Down & Connor, February 1966, indicated a calming down of expectations about the Council and lessening of its significance in the life of the Church. He thanked McQuaid (23/2/66) for writing to him about it: "I am greatly encouraged to have your approval in the line I took. I feel one has to put the brake on this persistent effort to set up a new kind of Catholic Church"(Ar-6).

Philbin's pastoral inclined to warnings and the need to take care. Expressions were typically: "not to exaggerate the significance of the change"; "the principle of authority is not superseded"; "'ecumenism' is a new use of old language"; "something which is called 'the spirit of the Council' or 'the mind of Pope John' is appealed to as a substitute for the actual detail of its Decrees"; "The Vatican Council...has altered relatively little..."; "let no one mislead us into thinking that the Church has been cut adrift from its moorings by the Vatican Council".

Conservatives and Liberals

Polarisation of views at the Council led journalists to adopt labels of liberal and conservative as "useful shorthand" (Louis McRedmond) for those bishops who were for or against the changes proposed. Individual bishops might favour one change and not another, but the labels, in general, stuck.

Liberals were also described as progressive or anti-curial, while conservatives were reactionary or curial.

McRedmond sees McQuaid as the “classical conciliar conservative” who “fitted in very well with the curia mentality...and I think he was totally sincere about this...” Fagan holds that McQuaid was set in the old mould, but might have foreseen the opening up and then a bit of chaos, and that, perhaps sub-consciously, he felt he would lose control. Battelle does not agree that McQuaid’s mind was “totally closed” to the Council: “He was too loyal to Rome...and to the Pope, for him to close down [on] anything that emanated under the signature of the Pope”.

Liberal theologians

McQuaid did not trust ‘liberal’ theologians. He did not want them speaking in his diocese, nor people having access to their works. He feared the Catholic faith might be disturbed. Foyle says: “He was like a teacher, this is my patch and I decide what my people, my children are told”.

Interviews indicate that Dublin diocesan priests were as liberal, or as conservative, as others but generally kept their heads down during the McQuaid years. Fagan, a Marist priest, was appointed by McQuaid to the staff of Mater Dei Institute. He held liberal views, and still does, but McQuaid does not seem to have been worried about him. One day McQuaid offered him some newspapers from the United States: “You have to be very careful; strange things go on in America, terrible stuff. All this stuff about

confession". Fagan was familiar with them, but took them, not telling McQuaid that he agreed with them and, in fact, had written at least two articles in *Doctrine & Life* about the new ideas on reform of the sacrament of penance (confession).

McQuaid asked to have certain religious order priests removed from his diocese because he disagreed with their views. Father D says David Power, an Oblate, was removed because McQuaid did not like his book on the Eucharist and Hurley believes that perhaps this was so. Another source confirms this story and the full background of how the Oblate Provincial Superior bowed instantly to McQuaid's request and sent Power overnight to a non-job in Rome just as he had been preparing to take up a lecturing post at Milltown Park. Hurley says McQuaid wrote to his Rector, Fr. Cecil McGarry, in 1968, asking for him to be removed, but McGarry knew McQuaid well and was "able to deal with him in a friendly way". Flannery says McQuaid asked his Provincial, Fr. Louis Coffey, to remove him and Fr. Fergal O'Connor from the diocese. Coffey did not do so, but pleaded that O'Connor had severe arthritis and might not have so long to live. McQuaid relented. McQuaid never wrote nor spoke to any of these priests, he dealt only with their superiors.

Cooney (1999b:398) says the Redemptorist Provincial, Fr. Jack Whyte, moved Fr. Michael O'Connor, Editor of *Reality*, to the West Indies, with only ten days notice to leave the country. This was allegedly because McQuaid disliked some articles published in *Reality*, especially a survey of UCD

students which "exploded the myth" that those who went to UCD were "confirmed in their faith and those who went to Trinity [College] lost it"(B.Power, 1969). Cooney interviewed O'Connor.

McQuaid's concern at lay people being influenced by new theological views was illustrated when Louis McRedmond met him in Rome during the Council. McRedmond says McQuaid was "very gracious" and then said to him: "Now, Mr. McRedmond, have you read Novak?" Michael Novak was a lay commentator, then progressive in his views, who had recently written a challenging book, *The Open Church* (1964). McRedmond continues:

'Yes, indeed, Your Grace, I have read Novak', and he said to me, 'What do you think of him?' So, I expanded a little, I thought he was very good, I said [about] his approach and his historical understanding and that and then when I stopped, he said, 'Yes, a pernicious book, Mr. McRedmond, a pernicious book'.

Mgr. Patrick J.Hamell, Editor, *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, published a critique of Novak's book by Masterson and thanked McQuaid for securing

"this splendid and most important article. Dr. Masterson's assessment of Novak must be the most searching that has appeared...It will undo much of the harm caused by the book itself and the uncritical reviews of it that have been published".

McQuaid's note on the letter (30/11/64): "re Novak. You will not read a more accurate and acute analysis". Early notes for a draft of Masterson's

article, but very different from the published version (Masterson 1964) are included with Hamell's letter (Ar-76) and there are editing marks which Masterson confirms were made by his Dean of Faculty, at UCD, Mgr. John D. Horgan, who had suggested, without indicating McQuaid's involvement, that he write the article.

McQuaid did not like *A New Catechism – Catholic Faith for Adults*, commonly referred to as the 'Dutch Catechism', prepared by the Dutch Bishops and published soon after the Council. It seemed to confirm his fears about 'liberal' theologians. Nuncio McGeough told McQuaid (29/1/68) that Rome had not yet authorised the English translation of the Catechism. McQuaid's reply (31/1/68): "...I have never tolerated it, nor shall I, until the Holy See has declared it free from error" (Ar-22).

EARLY ATTITUDES TO THE COUNCIL

Priests' attitudes

Battelle says McQuaid was surrounded by a group of men "an awful lot more conservative" than himself, who "would have moved very slowly where change was concerned". As regards priests' personal expectations and attitudes to change, Battelle concedes that "a lot of us who had been ordained in the forties and the fifties were just a little bit slow to let go of the Latin". Murray suggests some older priests were difficult.

Stack sees the Council as "an extraordinarily important event which I still rejoice in...and a unique experience of opening up and of excitement and of interest in theology". Stack says there were priests who looked at "all this 'nonsense' of the Council, saying 'we'll get over that too', and the other extreme would be fellows who were 'heady' about it and ridiculously romantic, all was going to change.

For Moloney, "there are so many things that have been immensely enriched by it all". Ward remembers it as "a marvellous occasion and, filtering through, I suppose, already, in the early couple of years of the 60s". It was "extremely significant" and fulfilled his expectations. Ward suggests that the surprise was "so many participating bishops who wanted to put forward that there must be major change".

Curtin, a Clonliffe College lecturer, says staff did not know a great deal about the Council apart from what they read in the papers and magazines, especially *The Furrow*, and McQuaid never addressed them about it. He was surprised no member of the Clonliffe staff was sent out to Rome for the Council so that they may experience the process. For Connell:

It was undoubtedly a time of turmoil and some of us were, I suppose, sufficiently convinced of the value of the order that we had grown up in, to be somewhat sceptical about what was happening and, I suppose, in that sense, I would have been regarded as conservative.

Gaughan admits he was more interested in what he was doing at parish level than in the Council "as such". He believes "quite a lot of other priests" held the same view. Father C says it "upset a lot of the younger priests" when other dioceses seemed to be adopting liturgical changes "far ahead" of Dublin.

Foyle says many Dublin priests were for change and brought pressure on McQuaid to move quicker with the changes, but they played safe "on the ground". Fitz-Patrick feels priests were neither prepared nor educated to implement the changes of Vatican II: "It was a culture shock really". Scott believes "elderly men would have thought very badly...of converting to say Mass in English and facing the people and having to sort of have a rapport with them".

Celibacy

Few interviewees mentioned clerical celibacy, but Gill indicates McQuaid's concern about the matter. Gill was one of many, priests and laity, who signed a petition in Rome asking the Council Fathers to consider the issue. The *Sunday Independent* later heard about the petition and that the names of Gill and Mac Réamoinn were on it. They asked Gill for an article on the subject and he refused, but they ran a story: "Dublin publisher favours married clergy". Gill then heard: "His Grace is deeply disturbed about this". So he wrote to McQuaid, saying the *Sunday Independent* story was not true and he was one of several thousand people who signed the petition, and that if McQuaid had taken offence, he regretted it. McQuaid replied that "he

recalled my meeting and that I was clearly, seriously in need of further theological [education], that this was gravely offensive...that I was seriously misguided, that I had fallen into the wrong hands...". Mac Réamoinn says celibacy was only marginal during the Council: "...the possibilities of a non-celibate ministry would have been mentioned occasionally, but as one of those things a few years down..."

Lay people's attitudes

The laity also had mixed attitudes. Gallagher was impressed but says people didn't realise how quickly things would change. He believes the "elimination of Latin from the Mass was a good thing, you can now understand the prayers...". Gill got the sense that "there was a lot of enthusiasm". Lovatt-Dolan welcomed the new emphasis on the Church as the People of God and the changes in the liturgy. Scott was very glad that the changes occurred in his time because "I think they are for the better". Mac Réamoinn found "a very strong feeling of excitement, relief, or whatever, that there was real movement within the whole Church".

Gay Byrne didn't like the English Mass and he still doesn't like it: "When you lose the mystery and the awe, people get careless". Father C says the media were very pro-Council and gave it great prominence, so that a lot of lay people were excited, but a number of bishops were anxious and worried.

The Public Image Committee (1964) assessed lay attitudes:

It would seem that prior to the Council most Irish lay people took it for granted that there was an official line on most, if not all problems, and that Bishops more or less all held the same views without having to arrive at them by discussion. The Vatican Council, as reported by the Press, presented a very different picture. The laity may now have tended, understandably perhaps, to go to the extreme. The influence of the Vatican Council among the educated and influential classes in Ireland appears to have been very great. Their knowledge of the Council is derived to a great extent from popular reporting. From that reporting the Irish Hierarchy appears conservative (Ar-61).

THEOLOGY FOR THE LAITY

Gill saw growing interest in theology, but absence of facilities in Ireland for lay people to study it. "Theology was news, theology mattered", he says, and through his family publishing company, contributed to its popularity. The number of books they sold in their Logos series was "quite extraordinary...you would not see those numbers now...it probably began to fall off in the early 70s...". Masterson (1967) wrote about this phenomenon of "paperback theology" and how "suddenly theological issues became fashionable and interesting". Lovatt-Dolan recalls *Furrow* weekends where priests and lay people got together to discuss theology.

McQuaid's attitude was illustrated for Fagan when he visited DICS and, seeing *Herder Correspondence* on display, "sniffed at it and said, 'take it away'. When it was mentioned that Desmond Fennell was the editor, he commented curtly: "Self-taught". Horgan recalls Fagan telling him that the incident related to a book on birth control to which he had contributed and that he was the one dismissed as 'self-taught'.

Mater Dei Institute opened in 1966 and soon attracted lay people. When Murray came as a lecturer in 1969, there was quite a significant number of them and within three or four years "it was nearly all lay people". Greene says "one of the great aftermaths of the Council is that the laity have been pursuing ecclesiastical studies and they have been brought into a certain part of the collaborative ministry, but perhaps they feel that they should be in it a little more".

EARLY COUNCIL DOCUMENTS

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (4/12/63) was the first document of the Council. During McQuaid's years, its effects were the most visible because of changes in the Mass, sacraments and other liturgical matters. The *Decree on Ecumenism* (21/11/64), the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (4/12/64) and the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* (7/12/65) also drew special attention, but some of the other documents did not have such immediate effect. The Vatican website (www.vatican.va) has all of the Council documents in English. There are earlier translations and

commentaries in Abbott 1967, and Flannery and others edited the Scepter series from 1964.

Liturgy

Changes in the Mass, effectively the first since the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, were gradual, but everybody could soon see that the Mass was now spoken in their local language, the vernacular. Murray says liturgical change developed its own momentum, going further than the Council had decided. The Council said the place of Latin was to be kept "and they never assumed that the whole of the Mass would be in the vernacular".

McQuaid did not disguise how he felt, especially about some of changes in the Mass. He defended his position at the Public Image Committee (24/1/64):

In dealing with the modern call for a more pastoral liturgy, we should remember that our grandparents were able to know exactly what the Mass meant from the Key of Heaven where they had the Latin Ordinary of the Mass and an English translation, or prayers based on the Ordinary (Ar-61).

McQuaid's pastoral letter, *The Sacred Liturgy* (20/2/64), gave full support to the Council document and asked people to rejoice in it: "Forgotten now the words of controversy, the moments of tension when in our anxiety to be faithful to our sacred trust, each had striven in his human way, but with earnest faith, to formulate true teaching that would benefit the Church". He

was pleased that greater emphasis was to be given to the liturgy in seminary training, "not merely rubrics and ceremonies but the doctrine, history and spiritual application of the Liturgy". Not all, however, would change "but only that of which the change will promote the dignity of God's worship and make the meaning of that worship more easy to understand".

Lehane says McQuaid continued to say his own 'private' Mass in Latin, as it was still optional. "Isn't it much nicer?", he said to Lehane. McQuaid was in agreement with Nuncio Sensi's letter (8/7/65) that the Holy See was concerned about the "falling off in the standard of Latin studies in seminaries and other houses of formation for clerical students". In reply (10/7/65), McQuaid regretted that

"...we are approaching a position in which the clergy can no longer be regarded as a learned body in the old sense. And nothing can halt the progress...I have very firmly resisted the tendency to disregard the learning and the use of Latin"(Ar-21).

Battelle remembers "the main thing about John Charles was that he had a tremendous respect for the Eucharist", but his views were under strain. Greene says he did not want the Mass to be interpreted solely as a meal, "he was very keen on the emphasis on the sacrifice". Greene was a diocesan censor and was told to watch out for this point, McQuaid's secretary, O'Connell, giving him the 'mind' of McQuaid that "if any article came through that would reduce the Mass to being just a meal, even if you called it a sacred meal, that it was to be ostracised". Fehily says McQuaid saw a

problem in the Protestant churches regarding the Eucharist as a meal while "we regard it as a sacrifice, not a meal".

McQuaid provided new churches and schools as Dublin city spread into the suburbs and new housing estates, but was often criticised for building large churches of poor design. He defended himself at the Public Image Committee (24/1/64):

His Grace had been accused of building completely drab churches. He has in fact left every parish priest free to choose the architect and the design. The present Pope [Paul VI, on a visit in 1961] went around with His Grace to all the new churches in Dublin and examined them very closely. He commented 'these are lovely churches' and 'certainly you know them to be churches' (Ar-61).

McQuaid came to terms with changes in architecture and interior church design, especially the replacement of the traditional high altar by a small table-like structure closer to the people. In both cases he was more supportive of the changes than was generally believed.

Fagan was superior of the Marist Fathers community in Milltown in 1963: "I was re-doing the chapel and we moved the marble altar out from the back wall to have Mass facing the people". He said nothing about it to McQuaid as it was a private oratory and not a public chapel. At the same time, they built a large extension to their House of Studies and McQuaid came to bless it. Fagan says: "I didn't celebrate the Mass from behind, facing the people, as

I thought it would embarrass him". So, he said the Mass in front of the altar in the old way. McQuaid never made a single reference to the new altar, but two weeks later, a parish priest called and said the Archbishop had sent him out to have a look at the chapel. Soon after, another parish priest came with the same message. "And yet John Charles never said a word about it to me", says Fagan, but "he told these priests, who were looking for permission to refurbish their church, to go and look at ours in Milltown...He was impressed by it". Battelle says McQuaid had difficulty with the idea of the priest facing the people, was slow on the removal of the traditional altar-rails, and used to "cringe" at Lourdes when he saw portable altars being wheeled out in front of the permanent ones.

Gallagher, an architect, designed two later McQuaid churches, Our Lady Seat of Wisdom, Belfield (UCD) and the parish church of Our Lady of Dolours, Glasnevin. He says McQuaid "was very impressed" and "very pleased" when he came up with an octagonal church for Belfield that was post-Vatican II in design. The altar was free-standing and the tabernacle on a dais, or pedestal, behind it. When Gallagher had the sanctuary designed he asked McQuaid if he wanted altar-rails, McQuaid, in reply, wrote: "Dear Mr. Gallagher, in Dublin, we all kneel". When the design for the Glasnevin church was ready, Gallagher says McQuaid was so pleased that he said to the priests with him: 'Oh, by Jove, Fathers, have a look at this here'. He later told Gallagher: "You know, Vincent, what would others think about us now when we build this church"?

The Legion of Mary at the Council

McQuaid favoured the Legion of Mary, an association of Catholic laypeople organised on the model of an army, founded in 1921 by Frank Duff (1889-1980), another past pupil of Blackrock College. Gallagher refers to McQuaid's "respect and awe" for Duff and his sanctity. At this time the Legion claimed an active membership of nearly 1.5 million worldwide and nine million auxiliary members, but Duff was "uncomfortable" that the Council and its aftermath seemed to involve a swing away from Mariology. He was against those who suggested the Legion needed updating and change (Ar-81).

It has been said that it was not until the 1960s that Duff felt the Legion enjoyed McQuaid's "full support" (L.McRedmond 1996:89). Hartigan (2000:338) refers to the Legion's early impact on the prostitution issue in Dublin and the feeling it was encroaching on the priestly ministry, and the hostility the Legion encountered from McQuaid's predecessor, Edward Byrne, and other senior churchmen, in particular, between 1927 and 1935.

While McQuaid set up a praesidium [branch] of the Legion with the final year boys in Blackrock College in 1939 (Cooney 1999b:109), and saw the Legion as "a crucial force in creating a socially-minded Catholicism" (Cooney 1999b:118), there was an unease in his relationship with them after 1944 when he suppressed the Mercier Society for dialogue with Protestants, in which Duff and other legionaries were prominent. Fr. Michael O'Carroll

regarded this, and the similar suppression of The Pillar of Fire Society for dialogue with Jews, as serious mistakes by McQuaid (1998b:371).

There was speculation that the role of Mary and the Legion might be under fire at the later stages of the Council, but McQuaid assured Duff he would be there to carry on the fight for them. Duff to McQuaid (1/1/65): "We must all be happy at the providential turn which took place at the end of the last session in regard to Our Blessed Lady". Some had wanted a separate document about Mary, but the Council Fathers included the topic in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*. Duff made reference to a Cardinal Suenens letter not included in the files:

He is apparently completely satisfied about *De Ecclesia* [the Constitution] and Our Lady. You will notice his postscript about her and apostleship. Truly the campaign of the minimisers has boomeranged on themselves but they have been very successful in shaking the faith of many over the continent of Europe..."(Ar-81).

McQuaid replied (4/1/65) he did not know what the Cardinal meant by "the Legion in the next session" but "please God, I will be there and if the Legion comes up, I must be reckoned with" (Ar-81). Even after some disappointments, McQuaid still had fight left in him for the 'minimisers', or, we presume, the 'liberals'. Leon-Joseph Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, was a prominent and popular liberal at the Council, and a public champion of the Legion. He was a regular visitor to Ireland.

Duff continued his lobby for the Legion, writing to the Pope, who replied through Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State (6/1/65) with "praise and encouragement to the Legion of Mary, which, first born in the mystic climate of Catholic Ireland, has by now extended its beneficent action to every continent"(Ar-81). Duff passed this letter to McQuaid, who hoped (20/1/65) that the Pope's "patronage" would assist areas "where Bishops have not found space for the Legion"(Ar-81).

DUBLIN DIOCESAN PRESS OFFICE

In March 1965, McQuaid established the Dublin Diocesan Press Office (DDPO) with O.G. ("Ossie") Dowling, a *Sunday Independent* journalist, as Director. McQuaid was the first Irish bishop, indeed some (e.g.Coogan 1966) believe the first bishop in the world, to make such an appointment, and as early as 1957 he told Bishop Vincent Harly of Elphin that he had "a long discussion with Father Connolly on the project of a Press office" and that he would be meeting the editors of the chief newspapers and the Provincial Press Association (Ar-6).

MacMahon, prompted possibly by McQuaid, noted (16/1/64) before the first meeting of the Public Image Committee: "How far is the demand for information on church affairs a genuinely responsible one, and how far impertinent? What is the attitude of press, radio and TV in Dublin?" At the meeting (24/1/64): "[Mgr] O'Halloran [chairman] indicated the difficulty of

the Press in getting Diocesan information from the Secretary's desk at Archbishop's House. Would the Archbishop not appoint a PRO?"(Ar-61).

Interviewees praise McQuaid for the Press Office initiative. Power says it "surprised everybody", and that McQuaid was "innovative". Mac Réamoinn was happy in his professional dealings with Dowling and says he certainly did not become "clericalised". Fitz-Patrick found Dowling "very open and supportive" and saw it as a "progressive move in terms of communication". MacMahon, Dowling's day-to-day liaison with McQuaid, believes the Press Office was "very useful". He says he had "many times spoken" to McQuaid about the need for a press office (correspondence, 13/12/05).

The final decision followed a suggestion by Dowling, who in a letter to *The Irish Times* (26/2/65) had defended McQuaid against an unproven rumour that his opposition had caused a charity poetry reading in Dublin by actors, Richard Burton and Elizabeth Taylor, to be cancelled. McQuaid thanked him. Dowling told MacMahon (1/3/65) he seldom wrote letters to the papers, "but occasionally the weight of nonsense from our fringe of free thinkers and self-styled liberals grows too much to bear..."(Ar-31). MacMahon (2/3/65) invited Dowling to discuss public relations in the diocese and reported to McQuaid (4/3/65) that "the appointment of a full time press officer would be the only effective solution in bringing about a significant improvement (Ar-31). MacMahon told McQuaid (5/3/65) that Dowling had now offered to "volunteer his services as a part-time voluntary

information officer, should Your Grace prefer not to appoint a full-time press officer at this stage". McQuaid's note (11/3/65 at 2 pm): "Agreed on 'Dublin Press Relations Office'". A press release (15/3/65) announced the Office and Dowling's appointment and how it was in accordance with the Council *Decree on The Instruments of Social Communication* and how the media "today can have such far-reaching effects, for good or for evil, on so many people"(Ar-31).

The archives include *The Irish Times* editorial, *Experto Credite*, (16/3/65) which commented that the news that the "essentially conservative" Archbishop of Dublin

has appointed a press officer is of considerable interest. To some it may seem surprising that the Archbishop feels the need of any such officer. It has been rumoured for some time that the Archbishop has been concerned about his public image. Whether that rumour (which is very widespread) has any connection with this appointment it is impossible to say. And if it has, whether such an officer can make any alteration in an image built up over several years remains to be seen...(Ar-31).

Barrett commented to McQuaid (same day):

Isn't the Irish Times very bitter. They certainly don't like Your Grace's Press Relations Office. But this is not surprising, but rather a healthy sign. This attitude illustrates all the more the need for this new office. Today's leader, though personal and bitter, was poor (Ar-31).

McQuaid stated (22/4/65), the day before the Press Office was formally opened with a reception, mainly for journalists, that the purpose was "...to provide a service of news concerning diocesan happenings...True that press, radio, TV, have given a wide coverage to church events in this diocese. However, the setting up of a service that is professional will improve quantity and quality of information". Horgan (30/4/65) described the opening as a "pleasant, informal affair" and that McQuaid "circulated cheerfully among reporters after the speeches, saying that he was sure that they would be glad of the opportunity to 'see the ogre in his den'"(Ar-32).

MacMahon wrote to Dowling from Rome, September 1965, saying the Press Office had secured a greater 'presence' of the diocese, and of the Church, in the Irish media of communication and in the *Catholic Herald*, and that the purpose of such a presence was "pastoral, to secure the minds and hearts of the people of God" by communicating the message of the Gospel. Dowling was to visit Rome for the conclusion of the Council but he got a virus infection (Ar-36).

In October, Dowling spoke to a Pax Romana meeting in Carlow on 'The Layman and Communication within the Church'. The script indicates certain inputs from MacMahon and McQuaid. Dowling reported to McQuaid (25/10/65): "I do not think my paper was a particularly popular one with Pax Romana, though they were kind enough to compliment me on it". He told MacMahon (25/10/65) that, as expected, he was in "quite a hot seat" and this was evident from the discussion and questions after his paper:

It really does still continue to astonish me the widespread and deep-seated animosity towards us – I mean, the Diocese, in certain quarters. Because these people are more ready – and more able – to talk, one could very easily, of course, over estimate their influence (Ar-35).

McRedmond (1966c) said the press office was “still to be seen as place where frank questions will be frankly answered”. MacMahon noted to McQuaid (13/1/67) that Douglas Gageby, Editor, *The Irish Times*, had been asked on television how the appointment of Dowling had helped him and replied that Dowling “did ‘funnel’ some news in the way of his newspaper”. McQuaid underlined some news and noted: “a gentleman would have been generous”(Ar-42).

McQuaid’s comment to Nuncio Alibrandi (10/8/70), reflected a changing attitude to communications: “Five years experience of the Dublin Diocesan Press Office has shown the value of having a journalist as Director...Could communications form part of the civics syllabus?”(Ar-18). Dowling tried to change him further with a five-page memo (29/10/70):

“I do not subscribe to the opinion that there is in the press a great deal of hostility towards us. What is true, however, is the fact that there is a great awareness in press circles, of our tendency to regard communications as a one-way street. This is not conducive to the best relations. It is not indeed, remarkable to find newspapers viewing with a cold eye statements emanating from a source noted for its reluctance to offer comment when requested. Nobody appreciates better than I that some areas are delicate. On the other hand, many

refusals have seemed either unnecessary or unwise...Our Lord was never afraid to answer questions or to engage in disputation. Even in the market place" (Ar-50).

Communications Centre/Catholic Communications Institute

In June 1964, the Hierarchy appointed Fr. Dunn "Director of a Communications Centre, at an honorarium of 200 pounds a year to be paid out of the Hierarchy General Fund". Archbishop Morris of Cashel said it would serve "as a meeting place for those engaged in Catholic television work and would be helpful in the recruiting and training of new talent" (Ar-10). The Centre was not under McQuaid's control, but he made Dunn available to it, in addition to Radharc.

McQuaid and Dowling were soon isolated from the Communications Centre and ignored with regard to its activities. Dowling complained to McQuaid who said, "there will be plenty more of the same" (Ar-11). A serious instance of "more of the same" was when Bishop Donal Herlihy of Ferns launched the *Irish Ecumenism Directory* (16/1/69) at a press conference in Dublin and Dowling knew nothing until the *Evening Herald* rang him afterwards. Dowling told McQuaid, who noted: "I was unaware either that the Directory was to be published or that Ferns would give a press conference in my See City". Dowling asked Fr. Kevin McNamara, who had arranged the press conference, for a copy of the Directory but McNamara said he hadn't a spare copy, "however it is being published by CTSI and is expected within ten days". MacMahon (27/1/69) expressed displeasure to McNamara and

that "apart from other considerations, the matter proved a distinct embarrassment to His Grace owing to the resentment expressed by The Press to His Grace's Diocesan Press Office"(Ar-46).

McQuaid was not consulted when the Catholic Communications Institute (then the umbrella body for the Communications Centre, Veritas Publications - formerly CTSI - and a Research and Development Unit) advertised for a "Writer-Publicist" (6/2/70). MacMahon expressed fear that closure of the Diocesan Press Office would "no longer be an option but a necessity", probably within a year. McQuaid (4/3/70) did not accept this. He had discussions with Dunn who said the "Writer-Publicist" would only work in the Catholic Truth Society office. I got the job and it was finally titled "Assistant Editor, Veritas Publications". I was unaware of the sensitivity it had caused and never had any communication with McQuaid, MacMahon or Dowling about it (Ar-48). Unwittingly, before taking up the post, I caused further concern when, in a lecture to the Dublin branch of Tuairim, accused the Church of being too concerned with material things and said it should give its material treasures to charity (*Irish Press*, 20/3/70) (Ar-48).

MEDIA DURING THE COUNCIL

The opening of the Council (11/10/62) received prominent coverage in the Irish newspapers. Seán Cryan was there for the *Irish Press* and Liam Shine for the *Irish Independent*. The *Irish Times* did not have a staff reporter there

but coverage was by Michael Wall and agencies. Headlines, all on Page 1, were: "Vatican Council Opens" (*Irish Press*, 12/10/62); "Epochal Rome Event" (*Irish Independent* 12/10/62); "Pope and People Rejoice" (*The Irish Times* 12/10/62). The ceremonial splendour, with photographs and the Pope's address, were featured, as well as the evening torchlight procession. Cardinal D'Alton's message to the Irish people and the celebration of his 80th birthday was also prominent. After the opening, all took their reports from agencies, while RTE had Seán Mac Réamoinn and Kevin O'Kelly reporting and commenting at various stages during the Council. It was not until the final session that Irish staff journalists and commentators, Louis McRedmond, *Irish Independent* and John Horgan, *The Irish Times*, attended. Desmond Fisher represented *The Catholic Herald* of London.

Journalists at the Council

Journalists had difficulty getting information out of the Council. The debates were in Latin and not open to the press and the daily press releases were, at first, a list of speakers with a bland translated *précis*, without attribution, of what was said. The first session was worst in this regard, and procedures eased somewhat subsequently.

McRedmond (1964:6) says journalists at the first session

"...were deliberately thrown back on second-rate and third-rate sources...Of course the reports, qua reports, merited censure. But where did the major fault lie? It was indeed a classic example of the

Church's lack of understanding of the simple rule of evidence by which every reporter is bound...".

McRedmond received a "shattering jolt" on return to Ireland at the end of the Council. There was "confusion and misconception, disappointment and misplaced enthusiasm; scarcely an attitude could be found which coincided with what the journalist had known in the shadow of St. Peter's. It was humbling at first. Had I and my colleagues somehow fallen down on the job?"(1966a:7). Horgan has related a similar experience of how "astonishing and frustrating" it was to discover that "all the theological, historical and liturgical richness to which we had been exposed in Rome, and which had left an indelible mark on all who experienced it, had only touched the fringes of Irish Catholicism"(2003:241).

McQuaid remained remote from the media at the Council. Mac Réamoinn never met him in Rome and Horgan doesn't "recall ever talking to him". McRedmond had one meeting with him and, when he enquired at the Irish College for reactions, he was usually put on to MacMahon or Cremin.

Media coverage

McQuaid remained critical of the media coverage and when members of the Public Image Committee (24/1/64) expressed alarm at the rise of criticism about Church and bishops, McQuaid said:

I don't think we should be alarmed at the present climate. It was there, it always was, the Vatican Council has lifted it. The criticism produced is quite ignorant, the reporting on the Council has been very bad – deplorable. Even Schillebeeckx is inaccurate. If he, why not Desmond Fisher whose reporting I thought very objectionable. So how can you blame the people. But I should not be alarmed – just as I would not be alarmed at current press campaign. These are things I dare not say outside this room (Ar-61).

McQuaid told Burke Savage, from Rome (3/11/65): "I am dismayed by the facile ignorance of the journalists who are writing about the documents that have cost us years of work, and by the more facile dictation in regard to what we Bishops must now do" (Ar-26). McRedmond remembers McQuaid telling him: "You know, Mr. McRedmond, when I read the newspapers, I wonder are these people at the same Council as I am". In McRedmond's view, McQuaid felt the Council was being misrepresented in the way it was being publicised and he was referring to the 'progressive thinking' and 'intellectual' journalists and writers.

Ambrose McNicholl, OP, (1966a:153) seemed to understand this reasonable dilemma of McQuaid, and many others, when he said a bishop would not see things the same way as a *peritus*, nor a member of a conciliar commission the same way as a journalist, nor the official observer the same way as the man in the street.

MacMahon (15/9/65) told Dowling he believed there was "a serious vacuum in Irish reporting on the Council". He suggested that theological

experts prepare reports and analyses, which could be “vetted by the bishops and released through something like your office. Meantime certain points of view which assume that every situation can be explained by a progressive reactionary antithesis, hold the field” (Ar-34).

McQuaid commented to Dowling on the coverage of Pope Paul’s encyclical, *Mysterium Fidei* (15/9/65):

“His [McRedmond’s] report on *Mysterium Fidei* was tolerable, John Horgan’s lamentable in its ignorance and immaturity. Horgan has met the lightweights. The Encyclical has given great satisfaction, as a firm statement of the unchanged and unchanging doctrine of the Church...I hope, as the Council proceeds, the facile division into conservatives and progressives will be cast aside as an outdated cloak for want of knowledge or reflection” (Ar-34).

Dowling told MacMahon (20/9/65) his impression was that “Horgan is leading the way and Kevin O’Kelly [RTE], Mac Réamoinn and – to a lesser extent – McRedmond may be trying to out-Horgan Horgan. I really blame myself that I did not suggest going out with you for the first few weeks...(Ar-34).

MacMahon believes now that the journalists “did quite a useful job within the limits” and that they “somehow managed to get what was actually said in the Council by the various speakers”. He says they managed to give “a much more concrete account, a fuller account, perhaps from a critical point

of view, partisan to some extent...". Battelle says the Council was "well covered [by the media] but an awful lot of it went over their heads...over the heads of the ordinary people, and over the heads, even of an awful lot of priests...". Dermot McCarthy believes the "best purveyor of news about the Council here was radio". He pays tribute to Mac Réamoinn and O'Kelly, in particular, who "communicated the possibilities for the Church to priests around the country". Flannery believes the media played a "huge part" and that people like Horgan and Mac Réamoinn "did so much to bring the message of the Council to the ordinary Irish people".

Gallagher praises the journalists, while believing they knew very little on the subjects they were writing about. He welcomes the way they opened up the whole thing. Gill accepts that the journalists were not professional theologians, "but they had a very intelligent interest in what was going on in the Church generally...". Masterson thinks the journalists did a "marvellous job" and lauds them for their commitment and the excitement they generated. Fuller believes popular media coverage "gave the Council an immediacy and relevance in the general mind, which it would not otherwise have had", and that it also went some way to "demystifying the mystique which had surrounded the Irish bishops"(2002:234-5).

The Late Late Show, the Saturday evening television chat-show, produced and presented by Gay Byrne, was believed by many to have a major influence on Irish society. It was an immediate success when introduced in summer 1962 and Byrne presented it until the late 1990s. Corish says some

people date events as before and after the Council, "more probably it was before and after *The Late Late Show*". Corish believes it had an overall negative effect because "Gaybo [Byrne] shot sacred cows and didn't have much to put in instead". Byrne retains a friendly regard for McQuaid who once wrote to thank him for defending him on *The Late Late Show*. Byrne's reply (24/1/69), marked "personal" and on blue headed paper from his home in Howth, Co. Dublin, was "McQuaidesque" in its brevity (Ar-25):

Your Grace.

Thank you.

Say one for me, please.

Respectfully yours.

Gay Byrne.

Telefis Eireann (TE)

Irish television started on New Year's Eve, 1961. The Hierarchy Television Committee, in October 1959, had called for the bishops to see that the Church, "as custodian of faith and morals, has the machinery to make her influence felt on the new medium from the very beginning" (Ar-9).

McQuaid tried unsuccessfully to gain control over television coverage of religious matters. Canon Cathal McCarthy, President, Clonliffe College, was his unofficial liaison in Radio Eireann. McCarthy favoured 'informality' and never giving his office any particular title, "a policy which, I think, has resulted in smoothness" (to McQuaid, 23/11/60). McQuaid agreed

(24/11/60): "Your value to me lies in your present anonymity and your established good relations with Mr. L.O Broin [Secretary of the Department of Posts & Telegraphs]"(Ar-28). However, McQuaid saw need for the arrangement to become more formally recognised as his concern for some control over the new television station grew. He wrote to Eamonn Andrews, Chairman, Radio Eireann (11/10/61):

... I have appointed as my personal liaison priest in Dublin, the City and the Diocese in which is situated the Television Centre, the Very Rev. Canon Cathal McCarthy, Holy Cross College, Clonliffe. It is my hope that this appointment will facilitate the necessary consultations between the Television Authority and the Archbishop of Dublin. I will be glad to cooperate with the Authority in all that pertains to my office (Ar-27).

Dermot O'Flynn, Supreme Knight of St. Columbanus, saw "urgent need for the selection and training of an elite to recover these vital lines of communication [TE] of ideas to the general public". He gave McQuaid a report (7/3/62), stating only four of the 16 television producers were Catholics – Jim Fitzgerald, James Plunkett, Gerard Victory and Chloe Gibson and, of these, only the last two were "practising" Catholics. The others included Shelah Richards, producer of Religious Programmes, who was "a divorced actress", and Jack White, in charge of all religious programmes, who was "a non-Catholic and a liberal". O'Flynn said the report came from a "reliable source". A second report, presumably also from O'Flynn, profiled a number of lay people, not just in broadcasting, but in other areas

of public life, with the inference that they were not safe people to have on television (Ar-25).

McQuaid told McCarthy (16/9/62) that he gave Morris of Cashel as his "definite opinion" that McCarthy should be the Bishops' national director at TE.

"...I cannot see the present arrangements effecting any worthwhile results that would firmly establish in the station our policy or our prestige...the good of the Faith is what we must consider" (Ar-29).

The Hierarchy agreed (1/10/62):

that the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel should approach the Taoiseach without delay to express the grave concern of the Hierarchy concerning the personnel in Telefis Eireann and to protest against the appointment of unbelievers to key posts. It was also agreed that Fr. Joseph Dunne [sic], who had training in television, be appointed a whole-time executive assistant for religious broadcasting to Telefis Eireann, and that he act under the direction of the Chairman of [Hierarchy] Television Committee...(Ar-29).

Correspondence continued on the question of a priest director, but the issue changed to crisis while McQuaid was at the next session of the Council. Cathal McCarthy wrote to him (1/11/63) that Kevin McCourt, Director General, TE, had phoned to say that the TE authority "at their meeting yesterday, appointed Fr. Dodd, OP, as priest director. I must say the news

came as a great shock to me: for more reasons than one I felt sure that Fr. Joe Dunn would be accepted (Ar-29). McQuaid replied from Rome to this "surprising" letter (8/11/63) and that he had written directly to McCourt "thanking him for the courtesy of having communicated his decision to me through you and stating that, though I am the sole authority in this Diocese in which his station is situated, I know neither the priest nor his competence"(Ar-29).

McCourt (13/11/63) told McQuaid that the [Hierarchy's] Catholic Television Interim Committee

"accepted a condition of the Authority that it should have the selecting of a suitable person, and a short list of four names was submitted to me by the Committee for that purpose – the fourth being subsequently not available, I was told – it seemed to me that Father Romuald Dodd, OP, in all respects would be most suitable...I cannot but feel that your letter implies your disapproval of the nomination made by the Catholic Television Interim Committee..."(Ar-29).

McQuaid (15/11/63) regretted he knew nothing of a list presented, that he was unaware of a priest being appointed, that he received news of an appointment at second hand and "that I do not know the priest appointed in my diocese, where it is the Archbishop who is responsible for religious affairs"(Ar-29). McQuaid's control in TE (later RTE) effectively ended with Dodd's appointment and he soon realised it when a controversial, liberal theologian appeared on TE.

MacMahon (12/12/63) told McCourt that McQuaid had directed him to write and ask him to state "by whose authority Rev. Gregory Baum, OSA, who appeared on a TE programme, was invited to speak and did speak in this diocese on matters of Faith and Morals. McCourt (17/12/63) said Baum had been interviewed in connection with the proceedings of the Vatican Council and since he was "a well-known expert on the ecumenical movement and was attached to the Council", it was taken for granted he was well qualified to comment on the proceedings there. McCourt said TE were responsible for using Baum's services "but we would assume that, if he required ecclesiastical clearance to participate in the programme of the kind involved, this would be a matter between him and the ecclesiastical authorities". McQuaid's note (18/12/63): "No answer sent"(Ar-25). There was not further correspondence.

McQuaid remained critical of Dodd. Replying to Cathal McCarthy, who was worried about the presentation of "religious and para-religious programmes on TV" and that there seemed to be no one "who keeps a watch on them", McQuaid wrote (9/5/68): "I am glad to have your note, for it confirms what I have always held...When I consider the care with which you treated radio matters, I am shocked by the nonchalance or failure of the present controller, Father Dodd" (Ar-25).

7: VATICAN II – ESTABLISHMENT, 1965-1968

THIS CHAPTER looks at the aftermath of the Council and what happened when the bishops came home to implement its decisions. McQuaid was reluctant to match the high expectations of the more active publics in Dublin, which had been fuelled by conscientious and probing media coverage and a new transparency in Church governance which had developed at the Council. He accepted the changes and diligently obeyed the directives that came from Rome, but felt there was more change coming than had been intended by the Council. Impatience grew among certain priests and lay people, and there were frequent media attacks, but he stood his ground with strong support from many of his priests. He took several initiatives in the diocese – Diocesan Press Office, Council of Priests, Mater Dei Institute, Church Unity week lectures, the reception for World Communications Day 1967 and various commissions, and was probably conscious of what the Public Image Committee had told him, but he was most concerned lest the ‘simple faithful’ be confused or disturbed in their faith or religious practice.

“NO CHANGE”

McQuaid spoke in Dublin’s Pro-Cathedral on return from the final session of the Council, December 1965. There were some misinterpretations placed on his address which was issued by the Diocesan Press Office (Ar-38):

"...You may, in the last four years, have been disturbed at times by reports about the Council. May I who have assisted at every meeting of the Council assure you that the Council was a wondrous example of dignity and seriousness and courtesy. You may have been worried by much talk of changes to come. Allow me to reassure you. No change will worry the tranquillity of your Christian lives. For, time after time, Pope John XXIII and our present Holy Father have insisted – but the point has been sadly missed – that our deliberations in the Council had only one purpose: to search the deposit of the Faith, to look more deeply into the teaching of the Church that we, the Faithful, the Religious and the Priests and Bishops might be able to meet more firmly the changed circumstances of our present world...As the months will pass, gradually the Holy Father will instruct us how to put into effect the enactments of the Council. With complete loyalty, as children of the one, true Church, we fully accept each and every decree of the Vatican Council".

"No change" was the headline which emerged from this address. It was misleading and it misled. It was the relational episode mentioned most frequently and most spontaneously in the interviews. As soon as the words "John Charles McQuaid" and "Vatican Council" were spoken, the almost immediate response was "No change".

Fitz-Patrick was "just gob-smacked". Dermot McCarthy asked himself if McQuaid were correct, then, "what was all the fuss about?" He claims priests about ten years older than him were "apoplectic". Louis McRedmond says McQuaid said very little at the Council but "his big statement was the famous one at the end, about not disturbing the tranquillity etc." Maeve McRedmond says it portrayed "a patronising

attitude. Don't think you will be disturbed, children...". Horgan admits "many people in the media, probably myself included...leapt on this as an example of how far behind the times he [McQuaid] was". Desmond Fisher (1967a) later interpreted it "...that Vatican II would make no change in the peaceful life of the Church in Ireland".

Murray says one has "to parse and analyse" anything McQuaid said, and that on this occasion he didn't tell his people there would be no change, but that change wouldn't ruffle the tranquillity of their Christian life. Murray suggests McQuaid was more worried about the tranquillity being ruffled than about the changes themselves. Fehily says McQuaid had a way of putting things across "in a very archaic way" and he meant "there would be no doctrinal change" and the doctrine did not change. Greene was with other priests in the Pro-Cathedral and they were "surprised" at what McQuaid said, "because we were under a different understanding due to press reports". Battelle suggests McQuaid spoke in this way because "he himself didn't understand the wind of change that was coming. I don't think any prophet or seer would have foreseen that". Curtin saw it as the indication that McQuaid would "totally fulfil every instruction he got from Rome" but agrees that "emotionally he found it difficult". MacMahon agrees McQuaid could have said it in a better way, but meant it to be a reassurance to his people. MacMahon sees McQuaid's approach as "...expressive of the approach of bishops at that time. They were the shepherds and the shepherd had to care for his flock...But at that precise moment, probably, it wasn't well-timed...".

McQuaid's consistency is seen when the Pro-Cathedral address is read alongside the letter to his priests on the eve of the Council in 1962, to his priests from Rome (23/11/65), and in the context of the Hierarchy group statement from Rome (8/12/65) (Ar-78). He wrote to his priests (23/11/65), "that we should all thank God for the happy conclusion of a Council that has been so visibly guided by God the Holy Ghost and that, for centuries to come, must influence the Church in her thought and discipline...", and that the Pope asked for prayers that "we may be able, in the years ahead, to understand more clearly the traditional and authentic teaching of the Church, as set forth by the Council..."(Ar-78). The Hierarchy stated (8/12/65), that during the past four years the Council had been "prayerfully studying the heritage of divine truth which the Church has received from God and the fruit of this meditation is now embodied in a great series of constitutions and decrees...We now face the great challenge of implementing the decisions of the Council...In the years to come...there will be many changes in the external life of the church..."(Ar-78). Archbishop Morris of Cashel (in K.Wood 1997) agreed with McQuaid – who he admitted was too conservative for his taste – that "it was a good time to reassure people".

Cooney (1998d:371) contrasts McQuaid's "No Change" address with Pope Paul's address to the Italian bishops, three days previously. Asked whether everything would remain the same after the Council, Paul said: "The spirit of the Council says, NO! I, we, and we above all, must make some change – and it will not be a trifling change". It is surprising that in the three weeks

after McQuaid's address, which so many people still remember so vividly, there was not any further editorial comment, only one letter in *The Irish Times*, from P. McDermott of Dublin (*Plus ça Change* - 16/12/65) and none in the *Irish Independent*.

IMPLEMENTING DECISIONS OF THE COUNCIL

McQuaid had respect for the Council documents, as in his gratitude when Nuncio Sensi (24/1/67) gave him "as a personal gift from the Holy Father", a copy of each of two books on the Council: *Ss. Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II. Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes* and *I Padri Presenti al Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II*. The second title, in Italian, was the complete presentations made by the Fathers to the Council (Ar-21). McQuaid's gifts to Simms of Wenger's books on the Council and then of the entire set of Decrees was a further indication of this respect, as was his donation of the Decrees to the Church of Ireland Training College (Ar-8).

Father D finds a "great spirituality in the [Council] documents...and the emphasis on baptism and that we are the People of God" and, for Butler, "the documents are very solemn things". Several commented that many of the changes, especially in liturgy, were not mentioned in the documents. Murray understands McQuaid's confusion, "because he was at the Council and he thought he knew what was said, and still the thing was pushing on and on...". Corish believes a lot was done in the name of the Council about which the Council never spoke, but people felt they had to stay on the

bandwagon. Referring to the 'spirit of the Council', Corish says the Council said nothing about removing Latin nor about the priest having to face the people at Mass. Connell is not "too sure" that McQuaid "would altogether have understood the enthusiasm for change manifested in some of those involved in the Council" nor that he "would have been in sympathy with the spirit in which changes were coming".

Whatever the spirit was, Louis McRedmond was struck by it in Rome: "When I got home I found a local church that was not imbued with the spirit of the Council", but "even if the spirit wasn't around [in Dublin] the people wanted to know all about it" and this was shown in the great attendances at the Milltown Park lectures.

McQuaid warned in his 1968 pastoral letter, *Our Faith*, that it was "not a renewal in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council to change the certain teaching of the Church of Christ for the partial vision of a private judgement. One may not tamper with the doctrine of the Church".

Implementation of Council documents and directives

Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro of Bologna, a leading reformer at the Council, headed the body in Rome for overseeing liturgical reforms. He wrote to Cardinal Conway of Armagh, January 1966, and to the chairmen of other national bishops' conferences, suggesting guidelines and asking how the reforms were working in practice (Ar-11). Conway was asked to pass this secret letter 'only' to the Bishops.

Lercaro noted places where the adoption of the vernacular in the Mass had given rise to "some signs of disquiet" and supported bishops who might decide to retain some Latin Masses in big cities and in places where there were a lot of tourists. He suggested "prudence should be our guide" about the priest at Mass facing the people. Provisional altars were gradually to disappear and give way to more permanent structures. If the tabernacle were to be in a place other than the altar, the bishop "must judge whether or not all requirements are met in the alternative proposal". Lercaro left each bishop to decide the best approach to implementation for his own diocese (Ar-11). It is clear McQuaid followed Lercaro's suggestions exactly from this letter of which the priests were unaware (at least officially!).

Murray points to "considerable evidence" that McQuaid "tried very hard" in implementing the Council. Father A believes he implemented "reluctantly". Fitz-Patrick says "there was very little encouragement or leadership from 'head office'...". Maeve McRedmond says that far from implementing the Council, McQuaid gave "little support" to priests like Hurley and Flannery who tried. Brophy remembers deadlines for implementing changes being set by the Hierarchy and in Dublin, in particular, "on the due date and not a day before it, nor a day after, these things happened". Mac Réamoinn says in Dublin, in particular, the changes came slowly and "the laity were certainly not following any great guidance from the leaders of the Church locally...". Butler refers to priests who had been "hyped up by the media" to expect all sorts of things, and who thought McQuaid "should have done more, and more rapidly".

Horgan asked MacMahon (14/2/66) to tell McQuaid "how glad and grateful we all are for the extent and nature of the liturgical changes announced over the weekend. For the first time, it seems, the English (or Irish) Mass is to be regarded as the norm, and the Latin as the exception" (Ar-53).

Father A says McQuaid's diocesan commissions on liturgy, music and so on, were "packed" with top people in the diocese "to keep the young crowd quiet", there was not consultation and if any put their heads "above the parapet" they were "shot at fairly sharply". Flannery recalls a Dominican priest, Liam Walsh, who resigned in protest from the liturgy commission because he felt McQuaid was handling it badly and implementation was proceeding too slowly. Walsh was then removed from all other positions he held in the diocese, including Mater Dei.

The procedure was that Rome issued directives and national hierarchies then drew up details of how they would implement them, submitted them back to Rome and waited for approval. Dermot McCarthy recalls delays with implementation being approved because those "who had been left to implement were the people back in the Curia...They dragged their feet".

Sometimes even McQuaid wondered why Rome was delaying, asking Conway (20/1/66):

"... if we could have official approval of the Preface in the Vernacular. The people are disconcerted by a fragmentary approval and would greatly welcome a clear cut at the Te Igitur. The French had their Preface approved, I see, in January which is late for them (Ar-6).

Conway sent McQuaid the translation of the Canon of the Mass (20/9/67) and McQuaid thanked him, saying: "At first sight, it reads to one who has used the sonorous Latin, a pedestrian composition despite the explanatory appendix"(Ar-6). When Conway told McQuaid (16/3/70) that changes in the Missa Chrismata on Holy Thursday would not be enforced that year, McQuaid noted: "Ackd: glad no more changes this year. Priests and people have had as much change as they can manage"(Ar-6). McQuaid does not say he himself cannot 'manage' change, but it is his priests and people, a way of speaking he frequently used, without consultation. McQuaid was critical of how Rome communicated its decisions. He suggested to Conway (25/1/69) "...that the Holy See [Rome] consider how it could make known its Decrees or pronouncements to residential Bishops, if not before, at least as soon as, the organs of the secular press are given a release"(Ar-6).

There are still mixed views on how the changes should have been implemented. MacMahon thinks "the pace was probably right". Power believes it was too rapid, even in Dublin, and a lot of people were upset by it. He says documents were interpreted by theologians who had a "liberal frame of mind" leading, for instance, to the summary removal of statues and side altars in churches and the end of devotions like the Miraculous Medal

and the Confraternity which had been very popular with the laity before the Council. MacMahon told Dowling (28/5/65) that the Press Office would respond to the claim that McQuaid was slower than other bishops in implementation of Conciliar directives, by saying that more adjustments were required in a diocese with over 100 parishes and three-quarters of a million Catholics than in smaller dioceses (Ar-32).

G.J.Bergin of Clondalkin (20/8/65) asked Dowling about the varying pace of implementation of the liturgical changes, from diocese to diocese, to which Dowling replied that it had been left to the bishops of each country to decide what prayers in the vernacular would be introduced first, "and each bishop was responsible for implementing this decision in his diocese...So far, in the Dublin diocese, the first steps have been taken. Other changes will follow, but the process will be gradual"(Ar-34).

Dowling told MacMahon (3/6/71) that a parishioner from Clogher Road claimed widespread dissatisfaction there because "over a year after the new Liturgy was supposed to be implemented, there is still no effort being made in St. Bernadette's to introduce such things as the Offertory Procession". Dowling agreed that Clogher Road, contrary to his informant's belief, might not be the only one out of step at all, "because I know of another parish where lay readers have not yet made an appearance at Sunday Mass"(Ar-51).

Burke Savage (1965b:327) defended McQuaid:

“...Other bishops have moved faster. Very good, but does that necessarily prove that they have been wiser?...the Archbishop’s point of view is at the very least arguable: don’t interfere too suddenly with the established patterns of things; novelty for novelty’s sake is a nine days wonder; habits that are slowly formed are most lasting”.

Obedience

The interviews confirm that obedience led McQuaid in implementing the Council, whether or not he agreed personally. He gave absolute obedience to Rome and, in turn, expected it also from his priests and people. Fehily says McQuaid “was interested in obeying everything...”; Father A: “...very strict about doing things that he said Rome said should be done”; Gallagher: that in anything “Holy Mother Church” decreed to do, “he was so diligent a disciple that he accepted it completely”; MacMahon: “...his approach was always obedience to the Holy See, obedience to authority” and he carried out the requirements of the Council “exactly”; Butler: “...he had a tremendous sense of obedience”; Louis McRedmond: “...he was obedient in doing what, I presume, Rome required him to do, but it would be hard to detect any great enthusiasm for conciliar attitudes”. Father C believes “most men in those days who were good at ruling were also good at obeying”.

Concelebration

McQuaid had difficulty with the restoration of concelebration, a common practice in the early Church of several priests together saying the same

Mass, and already referred to in the Council debate on the Liturgy. It arose at consecrations, or 'ordinations', of new bishops in the later years, and McQuaid did his best to avoid it. Archbishop Joseph Cunnane of Tuam invited McQuaid (7/3/69) to his episcopal ordination:

I wish to invite you, if you wish, to join with some of the other bishops in concelebrating the Mass. I realise however that you may not wish to do this, and I leave the matter entirely in Your Grace's own hands.

McQuaid's note (8/3/69): "Please excuse". He accepted the invitation to the ordination "but not to lunch"(Ar-7).

Some months earlier, when Joseph Carroll was appointed auxiliary Bishop of Dublin, there was no reference to concelebration and the ceremony was very clearly described as 'consecration' in the pre-conciliar style. Carroll told McQuaid in a telegram from Rome (6/11/68): "New Rite of Consecration not obligatory. Old Rite may be used"(Ar-7). Inviting McQuaid to Monaghan for his ordination in January 1970, Bishop Patrick Mulligan of Clogher wrote: "If you can come, perhaps you would like me to arrange accomodation [sic] and if you wish to concelebrate". McQuaid's note (28/12/69): "Yes: I hope to be present, but as I shall drive up that morning, may I be excused from concelebrating"(Ar-6).

McQuaid did not always refuse concelebration for others, as when Fr. Liam Carey requested it (30/8/67) for nine diocesan priests participating in a

residential Youth Leadership Seminar. McQuaid's note (30/8/67): "Yes, if rubrics strictly observed"(Ar-24). From January 1971, McQuaid allowed marriages in Dublin up to 4.30 pm and concelebration of Mass was now permitted at both marriages and funerals (Ar-50).

McQuaid warned against liturgical celebration and liturgical prayer replacing personal and private prayer, fearing the fundamentals of Christian faith might be softened. Archbishop Finbar Ryan, then retired from Trinidad, and back living in Cork, was of the same mind (16/1/70): "The great need, as I see it, is to inspire our people – priests, religious and laity – with realisation of the need for personal prayer"(Ar-16). Ryan, commenting on a letter from McQuaid, wrote (7/8/70): "I share your distress about the Rosary, especially about its rejection by priests and religious"(Ar-16).

McQuaid cautious

Caution characterised McQuaid's approach to the Conciliar changes. Gallagher, MacMahon and Butler, all of whom knew him well, approved of this. Butler believes McQuaid wanted change, but "gently", and he didn't want the people to be upset: "It was the people of his diocese that he had at heart. I think he knew that the priests would be OK...". He believes McQuaid wanted the Council, and its values, to be put into practice, but "slowly, slowly" because "he was afraid, I think, of the reaction of the Irish people...". MacMahon agrees McQuaid moved at a "somewhat slower pace than some countries moved" but, as a result, he had fewer negative and traditionalist reactions.

Battelle says that, when a change came, McQuaid wanted to consider its possible faults and excesses before allowing it. He does not believe McQuaid expected it all to "blow over" and for things to be back to what they were, but he doesn't think a "great deal of change took place in McQuaid's mind". Gaughan believes McQuaid was "cautious" and

...it was probably difficult for him [McQuaid] more than anybody else, being at the top, in the sense that the buck stops at the top, and it is very difficult when you haven't unanimity about change. So, it was difficult to drive a middle course.

Gallagher believes McQuaid was anxious to be seen "as a person who wished to go along with Vatican II, but doing it slowly" and that this best suited Irish traditions. For Maeve McRedmond, "he wanted things to go on as they were". For Power, McQuaid didn't want to see too much change but "always gave the impression that changes which were on the way were good". In his draft reply to Coogan (1965), which was not sent, McQuaid said "undoubtedly the process of *aggiornamento* is affecting the Church in every country. And it is worth remembering that this involves new emphasis on old truths, rather than new truths"(Ar-32).

Control of change

Battelle believes McQuaid was not against change "but he would like to control change himself...". Fagan, taking it from people who worked close to McQuaid, says he "wasn't interested in any kind of change that he couldn't control...But for people quoting Vatican II or saying 'the Vatican

wants this or that', he would have to check the canon law to see what status it had".

Butler says McQuaid didn't like experimentation unless he knew what was going on. He remembers him saying: "They are not going to experiment in my diocese". He believes McQuaid would have been easier on para-liturgy, celebrations not directly affecting the Mass or the Sacraments, but when it came to basics like the Mass, "his whole theological background, his age, his devotion to the Eucharist, naturally, wouldn't allow it".

PUBLIC IMAGE COMMITTEE

McQuaid set up an all-priest, secret, Public Image Committee (31/12/63) to "examine what is now called the public image of the Church in the Dublin Diocese". The members were: Mgr Michael O'Halloran, VG (Chairman); Fathers James Kavanagh, Michael O'Neill (Columban), J.Ardle MacMahon, Leo Quinlan, Con Lee, Owen Sweeney, Conor Ward, Joseph Dunn, Roland Burke Savage (Jesuit) and Liam Carey. They would "gather evidence as to the 'public image' or 'impact' of the Church in Dublin and consider means of improving that 'image' with a view to strengthening the Faith". Apart from the report which was issued in June 1964, and an earlier draft report, the diocesan archives contain an account of the first meeting at Archbishop's House (24/1/64) when McQuaid engaged in discussion on such topics as increased criticism of the Church, the impact of the Council, reform of the liturgy and changing attitudes to authority (Ar-61).

Ward (conversation, 15/12/05) does not remember very much about the Committee but that it was a surprise and the members, apart from the Chairman, were all young priests and could not be seen as 'yes-men'. Mgr. Owen Sweeney (conversation, 18/2/06) has a clear recollection and agrees that the Committee was a surprise and the openness of its discussions and recommendations was encouraging. He was soon afterwards re-appointed to work with the emigrant chaplaincy in England but his perception at the time was that McQuaid took very little notice of the Committee's recommendations. MacMahon (correspondence, 13/12/05) "confesses" that he has "no recollection" of attending the meetings of the Committee. Coogan (1966:236) mentions the Committee and that its findings were kept secret, "well, almost secret".

MacMahon took notes of that first meeting and the copy in the archives has McQuaid's handwritten insertions, implying he approved the overall account. The minutes, with numbers instead of names attributed, are also in the files. Points from the first meeting, from the draft report (which McQuaid obviously saw) and from the final report, have been quoted throughout this research within the contexts of the topics raised.

MacMahon recorded McQuaid's demand for secrecy: "Keep completely to yourselves that you meet, where you meet, who was there – otherwise you will be burdened in your deliberation". McQuaid suggested six months for the report which "would be lodged in the secret archives where it would be of value in the future...That there is a change, His Grace said, we will all

agree, but not a revolution". McQuaid reiterated the need for secrecy when Dunn said he had heard of the meeting from "persons outside the group", just two days after being called to it:

"The Archbishop: The importance of secrecy was that it would hinder the deliberations to be pressurised from all sides. Secrecy is essential for good work. Had they noticed that no lay people were on the Committee? This was also so that their deliberations should not be hindered."

MacMahon (24/1/64) noted McQuaid was "somewhat disappointed": "...He felt the discussion centred too much on him personally. The image of the Church was not the same as the image of the Archbishop".

The Public Image Committee met 18 times between 24/1/64 and 30/5/64 and presented its 22-page report to McQuaid on 5/6/64, dealing with general considerations and then "summary of some unfavourable elements in the current image of the Church in Dublin, and some suggestions". The elements were taken under the headings of priests and people, religious, the Hierarchy, education, the social apostolate and the communication of ideas. The 'RBS' initialled copy of the 'draft' report has comment on McQuaid which was not included in the final report:

The priests and faithful of the Archdiocese feel that like the rest of the Irish bishops, His Grace does not give them that positive leadership which would give them pride and confidence in their Church (The

fact that others, delegated by His Grace, do give a lead does not alter the disillusionment, e.g. had His Grace appeared personally on television to make the laudable appeal in the recent housing crisis, a great impact would have been made on public opinion) (Ar-61).

COLLEGIALITY

Collegiality, the bishops of a country or region, acting as a college, with the Pope, and each retaining autonomy in his own diocese, was an important outcome of the Council, but did not feature strongly in the interviews. The role of national bishops' conferences was developed after the Council. It is common practice, now, for bishops' conferences to adopt policies, issue statements and act as a college. The Irish bishops' conference was, in the eighteenth century, one of the first to be established. It is a loose structure without any permanent secretariat but had sub-committees, even before the Council. Bishop Willie Walsh of Killaloe (RTE Television 2002) said the Conference can make a decision and "I can say, sorry, we're not implementing that in Killaloe and the Conference has no legal power to do so...each one is ultimately responsible to Rome". The Government was interested in the collegiality debate at the Council and its implications for the bishops as a lobby group in the social and educational fields. Commins, Irish Ambassador to the Holy See, told McCann, Secretary, Department of External Affairs in Dublin (23/11/63) that while the implications for the secular Government were obvious,

"what our Bishops think collectively on the subject I am not in a position to say, but, certainly, Archbishop McQuaid as well as Dr Browne of Galway have expressed themselves...as opposed to the grant of power to the National Episcopal Conference which could or might be held to limit or modify in any way the supreme power exercised by an individual Bishop in his own diocese"(Ar-2).

MacMahon agrees with "the change in the direction of the greater sense of collegiality", in other words, the "evolvment of the People of God, and the community aspect...". Another priest, who was close to McQuaid, says the Council made a very big change overnight, with the whole concept of collegiality, almost in a democratic style of government. He says this was new to McQuaid and he did not find it easy. McQuaid was concerned that collegiality might undermine both the primacy of the Pope and the bishop in his own diocese. He congratulated Mgr. Parente of the Holy Office (8/11/63) who had spoken at the Council:

It seems to me, if I am correct, that there is much confused thinking about *collegialitas*. It is almost a magic word, like *mysterium* in the writings of some authors. Under cover of the word, may not one fear a certain tendency to assert an independence in regard to the Holy Father? (Ar-75).

McQuaid (16/11/63) wrote to Mgr. Staffa who had also spoken, that he could not accept the notion of "*collegialitas episcoporum*" except in the full Roman sense, "...a total dependence, in essence and in actuality, on the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiff as defined in Vatican I"(Ar-75).

McQuaid realised after the Council that he had less support at the Irish Episcopal Conference and seemed disillusioned when replying to Conway (20/9/67) for comments on the Synod [of Bishops, in Rome] programme: "Mine will be brief, and they will have no effect on the ultimate decision"(Ar-6).

McQuaid was disappointed when, after agreeing to remove the ban on Catholics attending Trinity College (24/6/70), the Hierarchy passed a resolution that a chaplain be appointed to the College. McQuaid saw this as ceding a bargaining point that could be used in further negotiations with Trinity and, among his notes, probably for an intervention at the continuation of the Bishops' meeting next day, he wrote that:

such a resolution passed by this assembly in effect forces the Archbishop of Dublin to take a certain step within his own Diocese. It will be the first occasion on which the Episcopal Conference will have forced a measure on an individual Bishop (Ar-13).

Diocesan Council of Priests

One outcome of collegiality was diocesan councils of priests to participate in the running of dioceses. MacMahon sees it as another example of McQuaid's "diligence" that he appointed one in Dublin before most other dioceses. Curtin also sees it as "an important development" and an indication that McQuaid wanted to implement the Council. Dublin's first Council of Priests was appointed for three years, but the next one was, for the most part, elected. The function of the new Council (11/10/66) was "...to implement

the '*Decree On the Ministry and Life of Priests*' and the Motu Proprio, '*Ecclesiae Sanctae*', No. 15, which was issued by Pope Paul on August 6, 1966". The purpose was "to give, by its advice, effective assistance to the Bishop in ruling the Diocese". It was to have "merely a consultative voice" and the manner and forms of its working were to be determined by the Bishop (Ar-40).

Several priests, when asked, did not remember the first Council of Priests, or remembered it but thought it was ineffective. For Ward, it was "symbolic and useful to have" but its decisions "did not impinge" on him very much. Stack is doubtful what the first one, or even the second one, would have meant to McQuaid. He says no matter who was the chairman, McQuaid "would have regarded it as a plaything. He was headmaster and he knew what was best". MacMahon saw the Council of Priests' role in implementing Vatican II in the diocese: "Some of them would have liked a faster pace, a more accelerated pace of reform". Gaughan believes there was disappointment among some priests because it was only consultative: "You were simply consulted and it could be ignored".

Parish councils

Parish councils, with laity and priests sharing in parish management and administration, were seen as collegiality at parish level. The Bishops' June 1969 meeting recommended that parish councils be "considered at an early date by Diocesan Councils of Priests, that the number of pilot schemes be extended and that where members are elected that the elections be by

written vote”(Ar-12). The next meeting, November 1969, noted progress in setting up councils had not been rapid enough but they “could become purely formal structures making little real contribution to the Christian life of a parish”(Ar-12).

McQuaid was criticised for slow introduction of parish councils in Dublin. Murray remembers there were “few enough” of them in the 1960s. When Father C informally gathered groups of young people from around the parish, his parish priest stopped him: “You haven’t a right to go and do this”. Gaughan sees a problem in the wrong sort of people being attracted to parish councils. His experience is that “some would be merely interested in discussion rather than helping in a practical way with the running of the parish”. Fehily expresses a similar difficulty, but Father B says his parish is fully managed by a lay committee. Fitz-Patrick says there were some councils in McQuaid’s time but his parish priest told him: “We don’t need that”.

When Dowling saw reference to Edenmore parish and a complaint that the parish council was overcharging for the use of the parish hall (*Evening Press* 4/11/68), he expressed surprise to MacMahon, as he had not been aware there was a parish council in Edenmore. There was, as far as he knew, only one parish with such an organisation, Marino, “and that what Canon Kelly had there was in fact not a full-scale parish council but a parish working party”. MacMahon (6/11/68) shared Dowling’s surprise but said it was possible there were parish councils in the diocese, although “it was made

clear at the last Diocesan Retreat that these Councils were not to be set up at present, without reference to the Archbishop" (Ar-45).

"THE EMPTY CHAIR"

Soon after McQuaid's silver jubilee as Archbishop (27/12/65), it was announced that, in January, during the annual Week of Prayer for Christian Unity (Church Unity Octave), he would join the Church of Ireland Archbishop, Simms, in the Mansion House, Dublin, for a public lecture on ecumenism. This was welcomed with surprise and interest grew after a report (*Irish Times*, 14/1/66) that the two archbishops would sit together in the front row and say The Lord's Prayer with the audience. Although there then seemed to be some doubt about the prayer in common, the event suggested McQuaid was embracing change. Burke Savage, not Dowling, organised the event. The lecturer was Mgr. Arthur Ryan from Queen's University, Belfast, a senior priest described by Hurley as a pre-Vatican II Catholic but respected as an ecumenist "in general terms".

Seven hundred people attended and Tobin (1984:189) contrasted it favourably with the exclusion of Protestants from the Patrician Congress celebrations five years previously. It is remembered, however, for the confusion in seating arrangements. When McQuaid mounted the platform with Ryan and the Papal Nuncio, an empty chair remained beside them. The *Irish Press* (19/1/66) reported other dignitaries, including President de Valera, Simms, the Lord Mayor and the Chief Justice arriving at the front of

the hall but finding they had no seats. James Dillon, a senior politician, offered his seat to the President and it was accepted with a smile, while ushers rushed to find seats for the others. What has lived in popular folklore has been the symbolism, or lack of it, of the "empty chair".

The *Irish Times* (22/1/66) said the meeting was well-meant but oversold and the "definite indication that the two Archbishops of Dublin would sit side by side raised hopes too much". The editorial writer regretted an "opportunity for a gesture of warmth and grace beyond the call of obvious ecclesiastical duty was missed". The audience, with the two archbishops, recited The Lord's Prayer and *The Irish Catholic Directory* (1967:715) saw this climax as "a direct implementation of the *Decree on Ecumenism* in which it is expressly stated that...prayers may be recited in common with non-Catholics". For many, however, 'The Empty Chair' came to symbolise their spontaneous memory and perception of McQuaid and ecumenism, just as 'No Change' symbolised McQuaid and the Council.

Horgan: "...people blamed McQuaid but the blame more properly resided with Burke Savage...plainly it was a public relations disaster...McQuaid would have recognised that...I am sure that Simms himself, personally, took no offence". Hurley also attributes a lot of the blame to Burke Savage. Louis McRedmond immediately "found it grossly and appallingly embarrassing". He was sitting beside Douglas Gageby, editor, *The Irish Times* who, with a smile, told him this would mean six months of letters to his paper and so the phrase 'The Empty Chair' was coined.

McRedmond finds this typical of McQuaid trying to "get in on the gesture" but thinks it ran "slap up against his own scrupulosity, that he felt he was the Archbishop of Dublin and could not bring himself to put the other man up there on an equal par with himself". He believes McQuaid knew "the contumely that this would bring upon him, but it wouldn't stop him from doing it". David Sheehy suggests McQuaid realised what had happened, but lacked the spontaneity to bring Simms up, and nobody else would dare do so. Masterson remembers "it turned out to be a bit chaotic...and, of course, it created a cause célèbre".

Burke Savage's letter to McQuaid (10/11/65) seems to have been the first proposal for the meeting: "Would you think of allowing the Centre of Religious Studies and Information of which you are the founder to run a series of lectures in the Mansion House during the Church Unity Octave to which both Catholics and our separated brethren could be invited..." (Ar-57). McQuaid refused the project as "premature" (17/11/65), saying

"...We as a Hierarchy must await the *Directorium Generale* [Directory on Ecumenism] and then must ourselves elaborate a *Directorium* for our own circumstances. Neither *Directorium* has even been adumbrated. I may not then anticipate the decisions of my fellow Bishops, even by a 'dramatic Christian (I would say Catholic) gesture'...Be certain that relatively few educated people understand Oecumenism. Ordinary people are merely ignorant or confused" (Ar-79).

When Burke Savage modified his proposal McQuaid replied (24/11/65):

"Your imagination is afire...I do not want my Jubilee to be signalised by a celebration on Ecumenism. Cannot you do as I suggested? Have a set of clear talks in which Rev. Hurley, SJ will not figure – anywhere you wish on what the Decree means"(Ar-79).

Burke Savage (6/12/65) sent, for McQuaid's approval, names of speakers for the lectures. McQuaid objected:

"...Are we so barren in Dublin, that we must search out aliens...Mr Justice Kenny does not at all suggest himself: he is not clear, and is therefore not able to clear up others...Fr. McGarry [Editor, *The Furrow*] publicly criticised me for appointing parish priests at 62 years. An arm-chair administrator, with no pastoral care...Dr. [Cecil] McGarry [Jesuit Rector] no. Dr. Daly [the future Cardinal] no...Give us Dublin. Mgr. A.Ryan [Belfast] is very good and a gentleman".

Nor did he want Fr. Witte, SJ, from the Gregorian University in Rome, "never heard of him", nor Dowdall, Abbot of Glenstal, nor Michael Gill ("too, too young") nor again J.G.McGarry ("he castigated me publicly"). He has a question mark opposite Cecil McGarry. Among replacement names he wants Cremin and Barrett (Ar-79).

McQuaid finally decided (14/12/65): "...You should be content with a Benediction in each parish Church, with the prayer for unity, and with one lecture, by Mgr. A. Ryan on Tues 18th, with the Nuncio presiding. I shall attend"(Ar-79). McQuaid showed humour in a further letter (11/1/66): "You are down an octave since I last saw you...Could you please invite Rev.

Dr. Cremin, Maynooth to your Tuesday affair. With kind hope that you will keep still down an octave"(Ar-79). McQuaid was getting ready for the scapegoating by distancing himself from "your Tuesday affair". There is no reference to Simms in the correspondence.

McQuaid's next letter (14/1/66) was headmasterly:

...I have read with dismay the report in today's Irish Times of [next] Tuesday's meeting. It is an altogether unauthorised report. I am obliged to apologise to the Apostolic Nuncio for this report. You will take it as a formal, most formal expression of my will that you must never again make any mention of the Archbishop on a published statement, without having first submitted to me that statement in writing (Ar-79).

This was the report that the two Archbishops would pray the Our Father together at the meeting.

McQuaid wrote again, same date, as Burke Savage had delivered his reply immediately by hand:

In view of the incredible statement attributed to you in the *Evening Press* you will understand that no one except Mr. O.G.Dowling is authorised by me to issue any statement concerning the Tuesday meeting, either before Tuesday or on Tuesday or after Tuesday (Ar-79).

McQuaid again (16/1/66):

"If you have any queries about seating, you can discuss the matter with Doctor MacMahon. I shall sit on the right of the Apostolic Nuncio on the platform...For what you should say, your text should first be passed by the Apostolic Nuncio who is chiefly concerned".

The blame for seating arrangements, if anything were to go wrong, now rested with MacMahon.

McQuaid thanked Burke Savage (19/1/66):

Last night's lecture was widely appreciated to an extent that surprised me greatly, in view of its technical character. I thank you for the pains you took to achieve the result which gave so many persons an accurate account of Ecumenism (Ar-79).

He made no reference to Simms, nor the empty chair, nor the embarrassment arising out of the confusion over seating.

Two days later the letters to *The Irish Times* were in full flow. Dowling told McQuaid (21/1/66): "The correspondence in *The Irish Times* on the Mansion House lecture continues. I do not have to reassure Your Grace that, despite repeated enquiries from the newspapers, we are not making any comment on the affair". McQuaid's note (22/1/66): "You make no answer whatever to anyone"(Ar-38).

Cooney (1999b:375) revealed a previously unpublished letter from McQuaid to Simms' wife, Mercy (15/4/66), acknowledging that she and her husband must have suffered because of the Mansion House affair. Blaming Burke Savage, he said, "if we had set out to be discourteous and hurtful, a more sure result could not have been secured – all because of a good man's failure to coordinate and organise". McQuaid claimed to have known nothing of the press release and "nothing about the empty chair", adding that he himself "did not know too well" which chair he was meant to take.

Burke Savage soon realised McQuaid was blaming him (30/9/66):

"Had I been keen on saving my own skin, I could have called off the meeting by a notice in the paper. I thought this would do Your Grace harm and so I went ahead in the full knowledge that I would be booted on all sides. I preferred to be the whipping boy because of regard and loyalty to you...

"Without ever asking for an explanation or of giving me a chance to offer any explanation, Your Grace formally denounced me to my own Provincial, and subsequently, I have good reason to believe, had a formal letter read at the Conferences in the diocese which put all the blame on me"(Ar-57).

McQuaid was annoyed (2/10/66):

"...You are convinced that the 'Greek Tragedy' was caused by my failure to see you. Without attempting to sift for you the accuracy or

inaccuracy of your beliefs, I shall be content to say that I am sorry for any fault I committed in all that period.

"I regret that I cannot accept your statement that I formally denounced you to your Provincial and, subsequently, *sine nomine* in a formal letter read to my clergy. I dealt not with the individual, nor with the local Superior, as is my practice, but with the major Superior, in a grave matter of public policy. Your description of my statement concerning the Mansion House meeting read to the clergy is not accurate...

"I thank you for the gratitude and loyalty that you have so often expressed and I trust that I have your prayers" (Ar-79).

This is the nearest to any evidence in this research that McQuaid ever apologised or admitted he had been wrong about anything.

McQuaid and Simms came together for another Church Unity Octave meeting in January 1967. It was organised by Fr. Liam Carey, Director of Dublin Institute of Adult Education (as DICS had been re-named), in the National Stadium, Dublin. McQuaid entered with Simms and sat beside him throughout (Ar-24). Masterson gave the second paper, in response to Patrick Boylan, a senior Dublin parish priest and biblical scholar. Masterson says he took "a more philosophical approach to ecumenism and tried to locate it in the context of the greater unification that was going on around the world generally". He says McQuaid clearly made an effort to be as "ecumenical as the matter allowed". This meeting did not receive the same publicity as the

Mansion House affair, and many of the interviewees do not remember it, possibly because it was non-controversial.

ECUMENISM

Mgr. Patrick J. Hamell, Vice-President Maynooth College, gave a conservative, Catholic view of ecumenism on the eve of Vatican II:

"The ecumenical movement can be described briefly as what non-Catholics are doing to foster Christian unity...Catholics do not take part in it, but follow it with sympathy and interest and have occasionally attended ecumenical gatherings as observers and have been received with the greatest courtesy"(1962:19-20).

Commins emphasised the importance of ecumenism at the Council (23/11/63), telling McCann that, despite the emphasis at the third session on the role of bishops, "...the theme of Ecumenism remained all pervading and, apart altogether from the individual Schema on Ecumenism, coloured consideration of all the other Schemata in more or less degree"(Ar-3).

McQuaid established a Centre of Religious Studies and Information in 1963 with Burke Savage as Director. It was first envisaged as similar to the London Catholic Enquiry Centre where non-Catholics could come for information about the Catholic Church, but by the time it started it was further intended to help lay people understand theology and matters emerging from Vatican II. In approving speakers for evening lectures in early 1965, McQuaid asked Burke Savage (1/2/65) to inform the press about

the Centre, but "emphasise its establishment by me last year – lest it be confused as an ecumenical gesture". Burke Savage (3/2/65) saw no need to point out that the gestation period was so long, but McQuaid, replied (4/2/65): "I should prefer to take more responsibility for the Centre venture than you kindly allow – come what may from our efforts...". McQuaid wanted it understood that the scheme was not modern nor, "as it is being suggested, another measure of *aggiornamento* wrung from the Archbishop by the criticism of journalists and others"(Ar-62). There was such a large attendance at the first lecture of a series on "Understanding the Liturgy", given by Mgr. Michael O'Connell, that it had to be repeated (*The Irish Times*, 16/2/65).

While McQuaid "did not tell his people that the *aggiornamento* was a good thing or a bad thing" (*Herder Correspondence*, July 1965), it was clear that he did not like it. The word, literally meaning updating or modernisation, was introduced by Pope John XXIII to convey the purpose of Vatican II. McQuaid shared his thoughts with Bishop Browne of Galway when he praised the Holy Faith nuns (30/12/67): "They will do anything to aid a parish priest. They are untouched by modern craze for '*aggiornamento*'"(Ar-7).

McQuaid was criticised for being anti-ecumenical in his attitude to mixed marriages. He did what he could to prevent them and then prescribed regulations that were stricter than in other dioceses and humiliating to the

non-Roman Catholic partner. The Public Image Committee (1964) reproached him:

The rules in this Archdiocese for the celebration of Mixed Marriages are an embarrassment to any priest who has to commend them to a couple...While having no doubt about the undesirability of mixed marriages, the Commission respectfully recommend that, when permission is given for such marriages, they should be celebrated with good grace (Ar-61).

A draft *Directory on Ecumenism*, prepared in Rome, under Cardinal Bea, and the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, was sent to Conway (17/3/66). It was marked "*sub secreto*" – only the Bishops knew about it at this stage. McQuaid's comments (26/4/66) purporting, as always, to represent the views of "our people", were very strong as regards the special circumstances of ecumenism in Dublin (Ar-11).

"... ecumenism is with us in Dublin, a gravely delicate process, which requires careful preparation and very tactful execution...It cannot be hastened, no matter what a minimal group may urge...For what concerns spiritual ecumenism: our people will readily agree to pray for the conversion of non-Catholics. For what concerns spiritual participation: our people take a very different attitude...Par 37(b) could be a grave scandal [It refers to possibility of church buildings being shared in some circumstances]...I should like to see very firmly safeguarded the rights of the local Bishop to judge the suitability of ecumenical efforts in his own territory...It must be emphasised that relations, social, professional and cultural, between Catholics and non-Catholics are in this Diocese quite charitable. Non-Catholics have

very frequently acknowledged the charity and justice uniformly shown them.”(Ar-11).

McQuaid added a final, handwritten paragraph inserted (presumably) before it was typed and sent to Bishop Herlihy, Secretary of the Hierarchy Commission on Ecumenism (26/4/66): “Cardinal Bea is a zealous man but he is not the Archbishop of Dublin where the situation needs very delicate handling”.

The Hierarchy meeting, June 1966, decided Catholics could now attend weddings, baptisms and funerals of non-Catholic friends, including being best man or bridesmaid at weddings; elected representatives and public officials could attend non-Catholic services in the course of their civic duties, and Catholics could attend common services like those organised for Remembrance Day. McQuaid was not happy when this was suggested and his note, on a letter from Herlihy (23/3/66), invoked his “people” once more: “Thank you. It will take a deal of explaining to my people”(Ar-11).

For Louis McRedmond, “the whole ecumenical exercise was very much welcomed in Ireland at the time at the level of gesture”, and he believes it never really advanced beyond that. While the question of praying together, but not sharing each other’s liturgical services, became accepted, “what was of course much slower off the ground was any theological approach”. He points encouragingly, to the annual Greenhills Conference which started in the late 1960s and the founding of the Irish School of Ecumenics in 1970, and

says: "These were important, serious attempts at ecumenism...and I would still feel, that the Catholic bishops in Ireland were very edgy about these serious things. They were all for the gesture".

Hurley also sees how McQuaid came to accept gestures in ecumenism and "when he thought it right and proper he had no difficulty being ecumenically correct and exquisitely polite". Hurley recalls McQuaid's 1967 Dublin meeting with Archbishop Ramsey of Canterbury and refers to his willingness to 'acquiesce' in the setting up of the Irish School of Ecumenics and to 'acquiesce' in the launch of a major book on Irish Anglicanism.

Battelle and Fehily deny McQuaid was anti-Protestant, citing his friendship with Archbishop and Mercy Simms as one example. Fehily insists McQuaid never "spoke disrespectfully" of a Protestant, maintaining there would never be trouble in talking to another person who also "tried to practise their faith fully". McQuaid told Whyte he had no difficulty working with Protestants, one of many instances being when he brought in a prominent freemason to play a very active role in the Ballyowen TB sanatorium project in the 1940s (Ar-82).

Mercy Simms proposed ideas to McQuaid that might have been more difficult through official channels, writing informally and, sometimes, apparently, without the knowledge of her husband. She thanked McQuaid (24/1/67) for a book on the life St. Teresa, and suggested, in relation to the forthcoming lectures in Dublin by Archbishop Ramsey:

You would probably find it an embarrassment to attend either of these yourself, but any observer you might send would be most welcome. George hopes to arrange a meeting, if possible, for you both sometime during his weekend here (Ar-8).

She suggested Unity Week, 1968, be marked

with joint Bible readings, interspersed with sacred music by various choirs ending perhaps with the Apostle's Creed as well as the Lord's Prayer? Your people seem eager for joint prayer and also long for more personal contact with you. If you read a lesson, it could have a wonderful effect on them – the Stadium would not hold all who would want to come.

McQuaid's note: "Thank you. Such a meeting would require much thought. Apparently the C of I Gazette does not approve of my inviting you and His Grace"(Ar-8).

Simms approached McQuaid (1/5/67) for this meeting with Ramsey during his June visit. McQuaid's noted he would be "honoured to meet with Dr. Ramsey". Simms then confirmed (25/5/67) he would bring Ramsey to call on McQuaid on 24 June (Ar-8). The meeting was a success, with a press photocall and favourable coverage. For instance, the *Sunday Mirror* had the three archbishops on page 1: "The man who came to tea" and noted that "the three church leaders drank tea and chatted for 30 minutes". However, it took persuasion from Dowling for McQuaid to agree to the photocall and he was not pleased at being pushed (Ar-42).

McQuaid's apparent lack of shift in attitude on ecumenism was shown in frequent pastoral letters after the Council. The *Irish Catholic Directory* (1969:727) quoted his 1968 letter, where he regretted the faithful might be "confused" by discussions during Church Unity Octave and

"...induced to forget that the Octave is chiefly an occasion for humble prayer that God in His Mercy, by the intercession of Our Blessed Lady, may hasten the day when all Christians now unfortunately separated from the Holy See in Faith and discipline, may accept the one true Church of Christ."

The Directory also quoted the *Church of Ireland Gazette* (21/1/68) that McQuaid's conception of prayer for unity "seems to be out of spirit with that of the Vatican Secretariat for Unity and is disappointing because it would make it difficult for all the followers of Christ to join in prayer for unity thus conceived". This was the letter which caused Feeney to apologise to all other Christians for McQuaid's position. An *Irish Times* editorial (15/1/68) said it would come as a considerable shock to "many deeply-committed Christians" and commented: "Dr. McQuaid's letters, as most people in his diocese know, are read by fellow-Christians outside his own persuasion with perturbation and with sadness".

In 1968, Mac Réamoinn read a lesson in St. Patrick's [Church of Ireland] Cathedral in Dublin at an interdenominational service for Martin Luther King. Mac Réamoinn didn't believe he needed McQuaid's permission, but didn't want to be discourteous because it was unusual, "probably the first

time that a Roman Catholic had taken part in a service there since the time of King James II [17th century]". So, afterwards, he rang Dowling to put it on the record. Dowling thanked him and he heard nothing more for some months until he rang Dowling about something else and Dowling said, "I should have been in touch with you... got a note from His Grace...I should have passed it on to you". Mac Réamoinn says he remembers the note clearly: "With regard to the participation by Mr. Seán Mac Réamoinn in a service in St. Patrick's Cathedral"- and no reference to Martin Luther King – "would you be kind enough to express my appreciation to Mr. Mac Réamoinn of his courtesy in informing me of this act, while deploring his action, which has caused widespread anxiety...". Mac Réamoinn laughs heartily as he recalls this: "Widespread anxiety. All over Dublin!" The archives back up Mac Réamoinn's accurate memory of this incident, which was taken very seriously in Archbishop's House. MacMahon to McQuaid (9/4/68):

I commented to Mr. Dowling that the discipline of the Liturgy in the Diocese was of such importance that Mr. Mac Réamoinn left himself open to severe criticism by reading a Lesson without permission; any integral judgement of the situation should take account of the Bishops' responsibility in this field (Ar-44).

McQuaid (17/7/69) congratulated Simms on his election as Archbishop of Armagh but expressed "deep regret" that he and his wife would leave Dublin. He wished them God's blessing in their "new and difficult sphere"

and "for very many kindnesses and a very constant courtesy, I am indeed grateful"(Ar-8).

Mac Réamoinn says Mercy Simms rang McQuaid to say farewell, as they were going to Armagh that evening, sooner than they had expected, and he said he would be around "in a minute or two":

And she said it was unlike him but he came around and spoke to both of them, and expressed great regret [that they were leaving Dublin]. And she walked down to the gate and he turned to her and said, 'somebody like me can only guess at the great value of the great service that a woman like yourself can do for a man in his position'.

This suggests that McQuaid's friendship with Simms was more than a gesture. With the exception of one letter, it seems to have been a feature since Simms' appointment as Archbishop in 1957, with regular exchanges of books and gifts (Ar-8). It seems, however, to have developed only after Simms was appointed to Dublin from Cork. He had been Dean of Residence (chaplain) in Trinity College from 1939 to 1952. When Philbin, then Bishop of Clonfert, asked McQuaid's views on whether he should speak to a Literary & Historical Society meeting in UCD, at which Simms was going to be present, McQuaid (9/1/57) urged him to accept: "Dr Simms, as I fully expected, is going to repeat his Cork tactics – attend everything, speak at everything. I shall take care of him quietly. His irruption into UCD, in view of his TCD background, will be a beginning of further worry"(Ar-6).

It would be hard to believe that the apparently sincere friendship with Simms over his remaining years was just a strategy of McQuaid to "take care of him quietly".

Evidence of later change in McQuaid's attitude, not just to Simms but to other dignitaries of the Church of Ireland, is clear in the courteous way he sent representatives to the consecration of their bishops – a gesture, and possibly only a gesture, but one that would have been sinful a few years before. Two examples were Dean Salmon of Christchurch Cathedral (13/11/69) inviting a representative to the enthronement of their new Archbishop [Alan Buchanan] on 22/11/69. McQuaid replied: "It is a pleasure to assure you that I have arranged with Mgr. Hurley, V.G. to assist at the enthronement". Again, in reply to Salmon who asked (25/8/70) the same for the consecration of Donal Caird as Bishop of Limerick, also in Christchurch Cathedral, McQuaid came back: "Thank you for the courteous invitation. I have asked Mgr. Hurley, Vicar General, to assist"(Ar-8). McQuaid, using the word "assist", rather than "attend" can mean more than being just a passive observer at the ceremony (Ar-8).

But the pendulum swung again. The *Sunday Independent* editorial (24/1/71) described Church Unity Octave having "begun on a rather frigid note for Catholics in the Archdiocese of Dublin". It would seem there were clear limits to McQuaid's ecumenical positions. His letter, read at all Masses, stated "only in the Catholic Church is found all the doctrine of Jesus Christ, unchanged and guaranteed to be unchanged, because of the infallibility that

he personally bestowed upon the Pope, successor of St. Peter, and upon His Church in which the bishops are the lawful successors of the Apostles". The editorial writer said McQuaid wanted unity "on his own terms" with the Protestants seeing the errors of their ways and rejoining the Catholic Church unconditionally and added that McQuaid's attitude towards Protestants had been "consistent and always unequivocal – they are totally in error and that is an end of it".

Trinity College, Dublin

Any discussion on McQuaid and ecumenism has to include the case of the University of Dublin, Trinity College, founded 1592. The Hierarchy, for many years, "under pain of mortal sin", banned Catholic students from attending Trinity College, Dublin. The ban, in Statute 287 of the Plenary Council of Maynooth, was re-iterated periodically and stated: "Only the Archbishop of Dublin is competent to decide circumstances in which attendance may be tolerated". McQuaid's Lenten Regulations, 1964, for example, stated: "Attendance may be tolerated only for grave and valid reasons and with the addition of definite measures, by which it is sought to safeguard the Faith and practice of a Catholic student"(Ar-43). The ban was maintained by the Hierarchy, not McQuaid, and long before they imposed such a ban, Trinity themselves had exercised one. Maeve McRedmond accepts it was not his idea, "but, he certainly agreed with it!" McQuaid told Whyte that people would not be so critical if they knew what happened to the applications for permission, and he gave a "slight nod of his head" to indicate that most of them were granted (Ar-82).

McQuaid, in 1959, took exception to Trinity raising funds in the USA and to F.H.Boland, Ireland's representative at the United Nations, and a Catholic, being a member of the fund-raising committee. He wrote to every bishop in the USA and Canada, with the agreement of Cardinal D'Alton and the Hierarchy, condemning the project and including a long, polemical statement on the Irish University question (Ar-9).

Hurley remembers his superiors, in 1962, indicating that, because of the Archbishop's well-known stance on the matter, he should decline an invitation to address the Student Christian Movement (SCM) in Trinity on "The Vatican Council and the Ecumenical Situation To-day". The meeting moved to a local hotel so that Hurley could give the lecture. Fitz-Patrick remembers a Dominican priest addressing a meeting during the campaign for nuclear disarmament, "and all hell broke loose next day. Archbishop McQuaid wanted to know who allowed this man to go to Trinity, 'he went in without my permission'". Fitz-Patrick attended Trinity with McQuaid's permission and he believes Catholic students there were "lepers" and totally "ignored" by McQuaid.

The draft report of the Public Image Committee (1964) said Trinity remained a "burning issue":

"...the appeal to Canon law as justification is no longer convincing. Though many feel that we should solve the problem by 'flooding' Trinity College with Catholics, public opinion in general does not

appear adverse to the law as such. However, public opinion does appear to discountenance the annual repetition of the prohibition at such length. And public opinion seems to see the need for the appointment of a full-time chaplain, to safeguard the faith of the large number of Catholic students in Trinity, many of them with the permission of His Grace, many more from England and foreign countries..."(Ar-61).

Cremin, with McQuaid's encouragement, delivered four talks on the Vatican Council, in Trinity, during Church Unity Octave, 1965. They were followed by questions, but not discussion, and he felt "much had already been achieved when we arrived, as we so often did, at the hard core of differences between us and agreed to differ"(Cremin 1965:357-60).

For the first time since 1944, probably influenced by the report of the Public Image Committee, McQuaid did not mention the Trinity ban in his 1965 or 1966 Lenten regulations, but it reappeared in 1967: "The law passed by all the Bishops of Ireland and confirmed by the Holy See has not been changed or relaxed. They who hear or read this authentic declaration cannot claim to act in good conscience when they violate this law (Ar-63).

The Irish Times (6/2/67) commented on this resurgence of the Trinity issue, and again the following week (13/2/67), saying it was "one of the festering sores in our community life". The *Sunday Independent* (12/2/67) had re-published McQuaid's 1961 pastoral letter on *Higher Education for Catholics*, with its attack on Trinity, in feature article format, alongside a friendly

editorial, "Attacks on the Archbishop of Dublin". McQuaid thanked the editor, Hector Legge, for "the courage of your editorial yesterday and for your sense of justice as a Catholic"(Ar-43).

The proposed UCD/Trinity merger which Donogh O'Malley, Minister for Education, announced some weeks later, hastened the end of the ban. There is a long, handwritten note by McQuaid about a meeting (2/5/67), which began over lunch with himself, Bishop Browne of Galway, Bishop Philbin of Down & Connor, Jeremiah Hogan, President of UCD, and Michael Tierney, the former President. Hogan and Tierney withdrew at 3 pm and the bishops were joined by the Minister and Toirleach O Raifeartaigh, Secretary, Department of Education. McQuaid described the three-hour discussion with O'Malley and O Raifeartaigh as

"very open, very explicit and friendly...The Minister thanks us, said he only wishes to do what we thought to be right and would gladly meet us as often as we wished. He could not have shown greater goodwill, good humour and realistic grasp of the difficult task before him".

The merger was soon floundering due to staff resistance and McQuaid did not want the bishops blamed but the process continued. He told Hogan (20/6/67) of his conviction "that the so-called merger is a morass of unsolved difficulties"(Ar-63).

Browne told McQuaid (8/2/69) of a meeting of the National University of Ireland Senate to consider and report on the new University Scheme, and how it agreed that "the ban on Trinity would go but no explanation was given of how Trinity would change its identity, ethos and constitution and how the new University would be Christian"(Ar-7). McQuaid replied (10/2/69):

"I am amazed at the statement that the ban would go. I never once gave Dr O Raifeartaigh the slightest hope that the ban could go until the Bishops were completely satisfied that the nature and status of Trinity had been so radically and legally altered that they could accept the new arrangement ...I am the more grateful for Your Lordship's letter in that I have been kept in the dark"(Ar-7).

The Trinity ban was finally lifted. The Bishops' meeting (25/6/70) announced:

"...Some hope for a change that would make this institution acceptable to the Catholic conscience was provided by the announcement of a proposed merger of Trinity College and University College, Dublin...In view of the substantial agreement on basic issues that has been reached by the National University of Ireland and Trinity College, the Hierarchy has decided to seek approval from the Holy See for repeal of Statute 287 of the Plenary Synod"(Ar-13).

McQuaid's copy of the minutes includes a handwritten note that the Trinity statement was passed by 18 votes to 8. The Bishops also passed a resolution

that a chaplaincy be set up. McQuaid did not see why "at this moment precisely, we should wish to urge the establishment of a chaplaincy. There is no immediate compelling reason. On the contrary a resolution calling on me to establish a chaplaincy is very badly timed, in my opinion"(Ar-13).

MATER DEI INSTITUTE

Interviewees praise McQuaid for establishing Mater Dei Institute in 1966. "Great credit is due to him..."(Griffin); "...very much ahead of his time in making that decision, which he did in conjunction with Mother Jordana, the Dominican nun"(Connell); "...forward-thinking"(Masterson); "...from the word go it was a success, but he wouldn't, he didn't, he consulted nobody"(Father B).

Judging it to be "one of the greatest" of McQuaid's contributions, MacMahon says it would not have been a result of the Council, but "would have been in line with insights he already had". Agreeing it was "farsighted", Ward also says Mater Dei would have come from McQuaid's own stated policies and his interest in education, and he was probably thinking of the need to have people, "qualified in a safe location like his own".

Ward's reference to a "safe location" ties in with the concern McQuaid is believed to have had for the orthodoxy of teaching at Maynooth in the 1960s (Cooney 1999b:382). His response was to withdraw his students from

Maynooth and strengthen Clonliffe, linking it, and then Mater Dei, with the Angelicum University in Rome for degrees in theology.

Mater Dei was not initially intended for the laity although it soon become predominantly so. It opened (17/10/66) with 35 nuns beginning a three year course in theology (ICD 1968:726). Fr. Joseph Carroll, President, Clonliffe College, said it had been founded

to give Religious Sisters and members of secular institutes the theological training which will be of benefit to them in their own personal lives and to the task committed to them by the Archbishop of imparting religious instruction to the youth of the Diocese (Ar-40).

CATECHESIS AND PREACHING

After the Council there were changes in catechesis, methods of religious instruction, both for schools and adults. McQuaid moved quickly, commissioning a laywoman, Mary Purcell, to write *The Word of Truth*, a new series of three texts for primary schools in the Dublin diocese. Conway (30/9/69) in a covering note to a discussion paper, "Ireland in the Seventies", said:

My impression is that the new programmes and methods now being used in the primary schools with the *On Our Way* series or the series by Mary Purcell, have been very successful and mark a distinct improvement on the older 'Catechism by Rote' method.

However, he did not have the same impression about post primary schools and there was "a great need for a competent study in depth in this field". He saw it as "a most sensitive field..."(Ar-6).

There was dissatisfaction with some of the early drafts of new texts circulated by the Post-Primary Religious Texts Commission and one of McQuaid's last letters was from Bishop Cahal Daly, then of Ardagh & Clonmacnoise (14/12/71), Chairman of the Episcopal Commission on Catechetics. McQuaid may have already complained, or Daly might have been anticipating complaint, when he wrote that he was "seriously dissatisfied with some of the contents of the booklets hitherto distributed", but that "none of the material was shown to me in advance of printing and distribution"(Ar-6).

Before the Council, there was a fixed programme of topics about the basic doctrines of the Church which priests preached at Sunday Mass. By 1970 it had been replaced by the homily drawn from the scriptural readings for the Mass of the day. Butler says "homilies are lovely", but catechesis is needed and he believes this was McQuaid's view also. He doesn't think McQuaid was happy with the new religious instruction after the Council and that for McQuaid, "the Catechism would last for another while and as the decrees of the Council were put into practice, then the Catechism could be brought up to speed".

Corish regrets the "near collapse of catechesis", believing that while there were things in the old catechism, inherited from the Council of Trent, that needed re-thinking, it had value in that the key concepts sank in through repetition in a way that does not happen with children nowadays.

Foyle sees deterioration in preaching as a "default effect" of the Council, which happened even if not intended: "Previously the sermon could pick an issue over a period and keep reminding us of the basis of this and that. The homilies became totally banal and boring". Foyle says the new preaching removed the devil and stopped talking about mortal sin and hell, and even purgatory, as a result of which people were no longer afraid. Foyle says McQuaid didn't but could have focused "tightly on his own clergy" to get them "preaching properly in a co-ordinated way". Gaughan agrees on a decline in preaching and in catechesis but also says, "in fairness to the Council", it was not intended. He says the Council was balanced but people "developed things out of it that it never intended". He says the decline in the teaching of religion in school and in preaching has led to a whole generation that has to a considerable extent "lost consciousness of sin, or wrongdoing, or immoral activity". Butler considers hell and damnation as only one aspect, but "I think the clergy, we, have failed a bit in giving the doctrine of the Church to the people...if there was a little catechesis, just a little, at every Mass every Sunday...the faith would be fine".

While some interviews reveal nostalgia for the old style catechetical instruction and preaching, the Public Image Committee report (1964) found

less enthusiasm and recommended change. They referred to a view expressed to them by lay people that "you never hear a good sermon in our parish" and commented:

The impact of the Council has made the laity more interested in developments in Scripture, dogmatic and pastoral theology. They are better informed, and more inclined to look for precise information and guidance from their clergy. It is difficult for priests to be up to date and confident.

Priests express great dissatisfaction with the programme of Catechetical instruction. A special commission on this point, especially in the light of Constitution on the Liturgy, may be necessary (Ar-61).

Carty (1967g) reflected criticisms of preaching with many of the laity acknowledging its influence upon them to be "negligible" and often bearing no relevance to life as they knew it. The long, old-style, denunciatory sermon was gone but, especially in vast city parishes, the sermon was too often composed as if there were only children present. However, there was one parish, St. Michael and St. John, on the Dublin City quays, where 3,000 people of all ages, from all sections of society, crowded in every week to listen in hushed silence to Fr. Jack Whelan. Carty attended and found "the old message of the Gospel, as new and as true today as ever, but it is the way he tells it that makes people come".

The bishops were worried. The Episcopal Commission on Doctrine, June 1968, reported:

The Sunday homily on the Gospel or Liturgy does not lend itself easily to sustained and systematic exposition of the doctrines of the Faith. It is urgently necessary that ways be found of reinstating the sort of coherent and continuous doctrinal and moral instruction, which used to be the aim of Diocesan programmes of Catechetical Instruction"(Ar-12).

8: VATICAN II – EROSION, 1968-1972

THIS CHAPTER traces the fall-out from Pope Paul VI's encyclical letter, *Humanae Vitae*, confirming the Church ban on artificial contraception, and the simultaneous erosion in enthusiasm for the Council. At the time, contraception was not just a theological issue for discussion in pastoral letters, but one which affected millions of Catholics. McQuaid was cautious in dealing with dissidents, managing to maintain a united diocese, unlike several other bishops in the world. But it was all over for him and he realised that, with advancing age, the world was leaving him behind. He was disappointed that the Pope promptly accepted his compulsory offer of resignation on reaching the age of 75, but he asked for another year and got it. He was certainly aware of the push to get him out and he went into a lonely retirement where he was ignored by many and died after just one year.

HUMANAE VITAE

Pope Paul VI removed contraception from discussion at the Council and, in 1964, appointed a Pontifical Commission on Population, Family and Birth to report to him. The Commission sat for two years and its report, made public in 1967, proposed that birth regulation by artificial methods might, in certain circumstances, be made acceptable.

The papal encyclical, *Humanae Vitae* (of Human Life), published 29/7/68, retained the ban on all artificial methods of contraception. Much has been written about reasons for the Pope's decision because it had been widely expected he would accept the Commission's report. Rice claims *Humanae Vitae* was "one of the greatest hoaxes of the 20th century, that the Pope then came out and condemned contraception not because he believed it was wrong but because he didn't want the Church to look bad". Rice's view is shared by many who spoke and wrote at the time and afterwards. Fr. Gabriel Daly, OSA, (2005:131) sees *Humanae Vitae* as "a highly symbolic act concerned more with church authority than with the substantive moral issues it dealt with". The encyclical resulted in unease throughout the Church and public rejection of the Pope's teaching by certain laity, clergy and even bishops.

Fagan explains how the Commission voted almost unanimously for change. Only four priests objected from its 72 clerical and lay members. They admitted that their position could not be proved, but claimed that changing the teaching would cause a schism in the Church. They wrote this to Pope Paul VI and continued to play on his fears as he prepared the encyclical. The Pope later said this was the worst period of his life, and he had to live with it. The tenour of this perspective is backed up by Kaiser (1987).

For Father C, *Humanae Vitae* was "a crushing blow" and induced "a tremendous sense of depression". He was visiting a seminary for lunch and

one of the priests arrived late to say he had just heard that the Pope had forbidden any kind of artificial contraception, any change in the Church law: "And you could hear a pin drop. And two men stood up and walked out, while another one or two were positively gloating". Dermod McCarthy says Fr. Kevin McNamara, Professor of Moral Theology at Maynooth, and later Archbishop of Dublin, was so convinced there would be change that he had prepared documentation for his students to justify the theological reasons for it.

Press conference

A Dublin press conference to introduce and explain the encyclical was held at Mater Dei. Opening it, McQuaid expressed "confident belief that this official teaching of the Church will find in the mind and heart of the priests entrusted to my pastoral care the response of an immediate renewal of loyalty to the Church". He then left, while Mgr. Cremin conducted the conference which, he said, was arranged by the Holy See with McQuaid providing the facilities (ICD 1969:752).

Louis McRedmond says there was a detailed summary, prepared by Cremin, but not the full text of the encyclical. Power recalls about "half a dozen questions" afterwards but then "Mgr. Cremin was so fulsome in what he said, we didn't need elaboration, I mean he had it all in script form, and most journalists took the easy way out". Horgan says Cremin spoke for nearly an hour, uninterrupted, "the journalists were with their jaws hanging open, wondering what on earth was going on...it was a harangue". Foyle

remembers journalists "snorting because the Pope wasn't changing to their liking. And they were stuck with the fact that there was no change. And you could feel the atmosphere...And then, *non licet*, no change". Foyle says "poor old Cremin was above being pilloried, and Paddy Gallagher [an RTE television reporter] huffing and puffing about lack of compassion in this treatment of unfortunate people" and Cremin could only reply: "How do you say 'no' nicely?"

An appreciation on Cremin's death stated he was "by conviction, not conditioning", consistently against contraception both before and after the encyclical and his typical question was: if the Church changed her mind on this vital issue, "which was the true Church – the one that had opposed contraception or the one that now accepted it" (*Irish Times*, 26/11/01). This would seem to have been McQuaid's dilemma also and on other issues such as ecumenism – if it was a sin to pray with Protestants before Vatican II and not now, had the Church's teaching been false? Which Church was to be believed?

Louis McRedmond had arranged to receive the full text through a contact in the Papal Nunciature, so he left the press conference early to return to his office for it. When he left, "in the corridor outside was a very anxious John Charles pacing up and down, all by himself". McRedmond said: "Your Grace, Dr. Cremin, he is having to bat on a pretty heavy wicket at the moment in there", to which McQuaid replied: "A brilliant man, Dr. Cremin, Mr. McRedmond, and will he be finished soon?" Power says McQuaid told

Cremin before he left Rome that he wanted him in Dublin, "the morning after next", to do the press conference. McQuaid used criticise Rome for releasing important information to the press before telling bishops, but he commented to Conway (25/1/69): "*Humanae Vitae*, in the manner of its release, was, in general, a distinct improvement"(Ar-6).

McQuaid assures the Pope

McQuaid sent an immediate telegram to Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, "on behalf of the clergy and the faithful of the Archdiocese of Dublin, and on my own part". He welcomed the Pope's "reaffirmation of the constant doctrine of the Church on marriage" and gave assurance of "our total acceptance of his official teaching"(ICD 1969:751-3). Cicognani (4/10/68) told McQuaid that the Pope thanked him for "the message of loyalty and support (Ar-18). McQuaid again had *Humane Vitae* in mind when he congratulated the Pope on the silver jubilee of his priesthood (23/5/70) and assured him of the fidelity of the Dublin priests and laity to his teachings:

It must be for the Holy Father a deep consolation to know that not a single priest of this Diocese has, by word or writing, failed fully to respect the teaching of the Pope on faith and morals.

The Faithful, too, for all the pressure of evil and all the influences of the mass media, remain in very greatest proportion, true to the Faith, and the practice of the Faith, especially to Holy Mass and Holy Communion (Ar-18).

Irish bishops and *Humanae Vitae*

The Irish Hierarchy (9/10/68) saw the encyclical as "the authoritative teaching of the Pope" and were confident the people would "accept it as such and give it that wholehearted assent which the Second Vatican Council requires". They said the Pope did not speak as "one theologian among many but as the Vicar of Christ who has the special assistance of the Holy Spirit in teaching the universal Church". The statement called for study and prayer and for priests in confession to show "understanding and sympathy", but "without compromise of principle".

Priests and *Humanae Vitae*

Flannery believes Dublin priests "kept ranks" over *Humanae Vitae*; Fagan, that they were "upset"; Griffin, that some of them were "very uneasy about it". Gaughan does not believe priests "had a difficult time" because "people made up their own minds and were sensible about it, but the man at the top had to lay down the principle". For Dermod McCarthy, *Humanae Vitae* was the "most disastrous document of the twentieth century" and caused "huge" problems for priests. He tried to implement it in the confession boxes, "with little sense of loyalty to it...no sense of belief that I was doing the right thing...trying to find loopholes...to find ways out of the actual letter of the law...". He believes it accounted for many of the priests who afterwards left ministry: "They decided not to go public on this in a confrontational way. They just decided to leave...".

Battelle admits a problem with *Humanae Vitae* and that it led to priests leaving the ministry. Griffin believes *Humanae Vitae* was a major factor in disturbing both laity and priests: "All hell was let loose. And a lot of laity left the Church at that time...And the number of priests who left Dublin after Vatican II was frightening, there must have been a hundred priests who left". Despite this impression, very few Dublin priests resigned during McQuaid's episcopacy. In response to a Catholic Communications Institute survey, McQuaid replied (31/3/71) that the numbers of Dublin priests who had left in the previous five years were: 1966 – 0; 1967 – 2; 1968 – 1; 1969 – 4; 1970 – 3 (Ar-14). However, editions of the Irish Catholic Directory, 1971 through 1977, show that, afterwards, the number of priests of the diocese, including retired priests, dropped from 603 to 550, with ordinations exceeding deaths by 10. This, assuming the accuracy of these figures, shows a drop of up to 63 in six years.

Laity and *Humanae Vitae*

Corish believes *Humanae Vitae*, for the laity, was "badly handled". It was a "marking point" because it was central to their lives, but "it was presented in terms of a theology where everything was forbidden and nearly everything was mortal sin". Louis McRedmond sees it as the first time bishops had to defend themselves against their laity. Father C remembers "a lot of people had dilemmas and talked about it. And it was through lay people that I began to feel this is wrong and that we shouldn't be so rigid in these things". He also says he could not ever be "rigid" in confession or when otherwise counselling people as to their practices about contraception,

but he worried about it, and "everybody knew that there was that report, that it was only a minority who favoured against changing".

Dermot Keogh (1994:267) believes many Irish people "simply chose to ignore the official church teaching" and to use 'artificial means' of birth control, although for some it meant their consciences "forced them to leave the church". For others, "loyalty to church teaching was paramount". Keogh's judgement is that the encyclical challenged the laity to "think for themselves and become, as a consequence, more independent of hierarchical structures". Fuller (2002:235) makes a similar judgement in the context of the Council's emphasis on the primacy of conscience, saying many Irish Catholics "appear to have decided that while the bishops might pronounce on issues of private morality they – the laity – were entitled to make up their own minds".

How McQuaid handled the issue

Greene thought the announcement and the press conference could have been handled in a "more understanding way" and that Cremin "was very much in tune with the mind of the Church, so therefore you got it, and you either took it or you didn't...". Father B gives McQuaid "some sort of credit" for the way he handled the issue and fallout from it, compared to certain bishops abroad, including his friend Cardinal Patrick O'Boyle, of Washington, DC, who suspended 19 dissenting priests with public controversy continuing for some years until the Vatican stepped in and calmed the storm. There was neither public sacking nor denunciation of

priests in Dublin who did not support it fully. When it was issued, Father B was one whom McQuaid asked to address meetings of priests in the diocese. He remembers being verbally attacked, "about to be devoured", by a large, elderly parish priest when he said dissent from the non-infallible teaching of the Pope was accepted in Catholic theology. He says McQuaid knew about this but he was never reprimanded. Battelle agrees McQuaid did not adopt a line of public reprimands for priests who seemed to be out of line, but "he would have spoken quietly to them". Gaughan says it was a very hard issue to "handle properly" but praises McQuaid who was "at the top of the pyramid" and had to set it out "in black and white". Lower down there was more flexibility and he himself would say to people: "Do the best you can". Butler says McQuaid never spoke to him about *Humanae Vitae*, but believes it "was a great trial" for him and "it distressed him greatly that people would blatantly and openly go against the teaching of the Pope".

Garret FitzGerald, later Taoiseach, and his wife, Joan, were at a Wexford conference, in September 1968, to discuss the encyclical. The conference issued a report on problems the encyclical created for a significant number of people. Vincent Grogan, Supreme Knight of St. Columbanus, on the participants' behalf, circulated the report to the Hierarchy. McQuaid replied: "I thank you for your manifesto. I feel sure that you would prefer to go to your judgement with the knowledge that you had done all in your power to secure full assent to the teaching of the Vicar of Christ"(FitzGerald 1991:84).

McQuaid supported O'Boyle of Washington DC against his priests who rebelled over *Humanae Vitae*, but did not adopt similar tactics in Dublin. O'Boyle sent McQuaid a booklet on *Humanae Vitae* (2/10/68) and McQuaid promised he would study it, praying "that God may give you courage to withstand steadfastly the disobedience of priests"(Ar-15). McQuaid also supported Bishop Cornelius Lucey of Cork who withdrew diocesan faculties for hearing confessions and for preaching from Fr. James Good who went public on "his deeply-felt conscientious objection to a non-infallible Papal Encyclical": "You have come out of the Good affair very handsomely. Congratulations"(Ar-6).

The Institute of Public Administration (IPA) asked Dowling (21/11/68) to chair a debate on the proposition: "That the people of Ireland should reject the terms of the Encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*" He told McQuaid he had declined and McQuaid noted: "You did well to refuse. The invitation was provocative and hurtful". McQuaid immediately wrote to the Principal, IPA: "I hereby formally protest, as Archbishop of Dublin, against a proposition that, in effect, suggests the apostasy of Catholics by the rejection of the explicit, authentic teaching of the Vicar of Christ"(Ar-45).

The Media and *Humanae Vitae*

Louis McRedmond says *Humanae Vitae* "did not get a very good run from the media in Ireland...it was all questioning, the editorials were questioning...there were as many critical articles as there were those that came out from predictable sources in support". He remembers how Cremin,

upset when he heard the *Irish Independent* was running the full text of the encyclical, rang him that evening and said the initial Latin text had some errors, but McRedmond assured him that a Latin scholar in the newspaper was checking that. An *Irish Independent* editorial (8/8/68) believed such protest as had emerged in Ireland might be "no more than the tip of an iceberg" with what the laity said in private going unrecorded and the clergy saying what they thought more often to their friends than to the newspapers.

EROSION OF COUNCIL ENTHUSIASM

Decline in enthusiasm for the Council is often traced to the *Humanae Vitae* controversy, the revolt of laity and priests against authority and then indications that the Vatican was trying to pull back on change. Louis McRedmond believes interest in the Council "all changed" after *Humanae Vitae*, "you didn't hear much more of meetings being organised around the country to explain aspects of Vatican II". Maeve McRedmond doesn't quite agree that the "great excitement" was really finished, and Louis concedes that *Humanae Vitae*: "...didn't finish it, but it put a big crack in it which brought it down in the end...The church authorities, I mean the bishops specifically, they closed ranks, they became suspicious of what was being written...".

Fitz-Patrick concedes there were "cosmetic changes" like lay readers in the church, but for him the euphoria of the Council evaporated and "a fog

descended". Father C calls for more patience in a Church which traditionally has thought in terms of centuries. He does not believe the Council can be submitted to a final judgement, even after forty years: "Anything that happened in the Church that was good, didn't happen suddenly. It was gradual. And I think that really it would be foolish for us to say the Vatican Council failed..."

It may have been a sign the conservatives were winning when Conway told McQuaid (31/10/69) that the Synod of Bishops in Rome "went well; no explosive proposals were pushed – I think those who might have been inclined to do so sensed that the general mood of the bishops was not propitious for their ideas"(Ar-6). Horgan reported the closure of *Herder Correspondence* and the comment of its editor, Robert Nowell, that it had "fallen victim to the aftermath of Vatican II, to the era of disillusion, contestation and polarisation that has succeeded the euphoric hopefulness the Council was able to generate"(1970a).

A bleak outlook

McQuaid sent comments "on our present situation" to Bishop Henry Murphy of Limerick (27/10/69), possibly in reply to an episcopal commission request for views. McQuaid believed there was

great need to explain and insist upon the following of Jesus Christ in self-denial, particularly in temperance. The new affluence affords new opportunities for unchastity, excess in alcoholic drinking,

unlawful expensiveness, neglect of debts, and in the case of those who have not ready money but must acquire it, larceny. The neglect of reasonably hard work, injustice towards employers are very common in the working class. Disregard for the person and interests of the workers is sadly evident in the attitude of many employers.

He lamented strikes that "paralyse so many enterprises" and pointed to "grave dangers" of urbanisation: "...for it displaces people, who, finding themselves in strange social conditions, tend to give up the practice of the Faith". He regretted family life was "losing its sacredness" because family prayer was not being taught and insisted on by parents:

...Hearing the children their catechism, saying with them morning and night prayer till they could be trusted to pray themselves, reciting the family Rosary are practices that are disappearing. The consequence is seen in the continuing failure to supervise the leisure and control the companions of the adolescents...

He believed young people were as generous as ever, "it is in their nature", but emphasis on liturgical prayer was tending "to eliminate the devotional practices that were the mainstay of the lives of our parents and grandparents". He saw a serious obligation to instruct seminarians in "the authentic doctrine of the Church" and "among the dogmas that most need to be explained and stressed is that of the teaching authority of the Church, in both Faith and Morals, as the authentic documents of the Church set forth that authority"(Ar-7).

These are bleak sentiments. There is little sign of influence from the Council which was to renew the Church, indeed the word 'Council' is not even mentioned. Was it that McQuaid, having tried to move forward and engage with the world, had now given up? There is evidence that between 1964 and 1968, especially after the Public Image Committee report, he tried to move with the times, in the spirit of Vatican II, and to engage with the changing world, but then he reverted, possibly because of shock at the response to *Humane Vitae*.

THREE LETTERS ON CONTRACEPTION

McQuaid's initial handling of *Humanae Vitae* was balanced, but he was more outspoken in his final year, knowing he was retiring, when he issued three statements against contraception. Few interviewees remember these letters, one on 25/11/70, next with the Lenten Regulations (17/2/71) and then a pastoral letter (22/3/71). He stated in the first letter that in a diocese there is "only one teaching authority" who

under the Pope and in union with him, is competent, by virtue of his sacred office, to declare the authentic and objective moral law that is binding on all the Faithful of his Diocese, both priests and lay folk. That authority is the Bishop.

He then "formally" declared the "doctrine of the objective moral law concerning the regulation of birth":

...every action which, either in anticipation of the marriage act or in accomplishment of that act, or in the development of the natural consequences of that act, proposes, either as an end or as a means, to make procreation impossible, is unlawful in itself. In other words, any such contraceptive act is wrong in itself. This is the constant teaching of the Church.

One reason for these letters was a Bill to legalise contraception in Ireland. It had been introduced by independent senators, Mary Robinson, John Horgan and Trevor West. In his March 1971 pastoral letter, condemning the proposed legislation, McQuaid asserted that if passed it would "offend objective moral law" and "would be, and would remain, a curse upon the country".

There were a lot of people in Ireland in those days who were still frightened by "curses", but I remember my mother saying to me, up the stairs: "He has gone too far. They will have to get rid of him". Horgan remembers it, particularly the reference to the "curse" which would remain upon the country. He says even the other bishops were annoyed with McQuaid and believes on this occasion McQuaid "broke ranks and went right off down the middle of the field carrying the ball on his own". It was McQuaid's final, significant public uttering.

Dermod McCarthy remembers the three statements but says they were not heeded, that McQuaid had become "irrelevant" by that time: "*Humanae Vitae* was ignored and anything that came after it was largely ignored...I can

remember reading it and throwing it down in frustration and disgust". Margaret MacCurtain (RTE Radio 2003b) believes McQuaid, at this stage, "was too old to grasp the significance of what he was issuing, that the subject of contraception had become so uncontrollable that it was almost lip-service, that final pastoral..."

MEDIA AFTER THE COUNCIL

Burke Savage and *Studies*

In *Studies*, Winter 1965 (published, March 1966), Burke Savage marked McQuaid's episcopal silver jubilee with a major profile. Intended to answer critics, it raised old arguments and, by not answering them adequately, provoked renewed criticism, with *Herder Correspondence*, (April 1966), dismissing it as an "apologia" for McQuaid. Burke Savage persuaded McQuaid on the article, but McQuaid had misgivings and wrote (16/3/65): "I really thought you had more sense. Imagine producing a pamphlet on my work up to summer 1965. Wait till I am dead (The Times editorial today shows you what you will be reading then)." Again (27/3/65): "I cannot prevent you writing in your *Studies*. But a pamphlet horrifies me *adhuc vivus*. Be modest and give facts, not eulogy and think of all that remains to be done". Again (2/4/65): "But I shall not object to a merely factual study and for that you can have all the help you wish here"(Ar-79). McQuaid told him (17/11/65) he was not worried what he would write about him: "... it will be well-meant, I am sure and I shall endure it, like other aspects of the coming Jubilee (Ar-79).

In March 1966, McQuaid told Burke Savage: "I have now read for the first time your sketch in *Studies*. It has involved a very great deal of toil. For that and for the kindness with which you have treated me I am indeed grateful"(Ar-79). However, this was a benign reaction to the article which he had himself seen and approved before publication, as Barrett (19/2/66), a man to whom he listened, had already expressed displeasure: "Personally, I feel unable to accept the author's facile assessments...The section on the critics troubled me. However adequately critics would seem to be dealt with, I don't think one can really catch up on them"(Ar-57).

It may have been McQuaid's more mature view when, replying to Burke Savage's accusations over the Mansion House meeting (2/10/66), he added: "For your article [*Studies*]. I disliked the very idea of an article; I yielded to your importunity. I disliked the article: I allowed it through because of your very evident good-will and very serious work. I dislike the article still"(Ar-79). Burke Savage had accused McQuaid of "effectively disowning him over the *Studies* article"(Ar-79). It was also the end of Burke Savage's biography idea. "You will allow me to say that I do not want any biographies. After my death, there will be a deep silence"(15/11/66)(Ar-79).

World Communications Day

McQuaid invited journalists and editors to a Mass and reception in Clonliffe College to celebrate World Communications Day, May 1967. Dowling suggested (7/5/67): "Since some Protestants will be on the invitation list, and it will be made clear that they may come only for the reception, would it

also be considered an ecumenical thought to invite the Church of Ireland press officer [Rev. R.A.Warke]". McQuaid noted: "He can do no harm"(Ar-52).

McQuaid's sermon (1967) referred to journalists' lives being:

passed in a whirlwind of events that are swept together in the disarray of human passion. Not yours the hermit-like seclusion in which the tranquil scholar can collect, assess and finally judge the evidence. You are obliged to be concerned with the concrete, the tangible, the vividly present, especially the fleeting and sensational. An avid public will not allow you the time that you yourselves would wish to have for due reflection.

The Irish Times (9/5/67) praised the sermon for being marked "not only by understanding of problems but also by compassion and clear-sightedness..."(Ar-53). Horgan saw it as a sign that McQuaid was changing and wished to have better relations with the press. He thanked McQuaid (16/5/67) "...for your kindness in meeting and entertaining us" and "for the sympathy and understanding in your sermon"(Ar-42).

McQuaid and McRedmond

McQuaid remained uneasy about journalistic coverage. He told Nuncio McGeough (21/3/68) he would do what he could in the future, "as I have in the past, to diffuse knowledge of the Holy Father's statements as a

counterbalance to the almost unlimited diffusion of the views of journalist theologians" (Ar-22).

The interviews did not focus strongly on the media after the Council but Louis McRedmond refers to McQuaid's liturgical directives to the clergy (1969). The Press Office had issued a release, but not the full text. McRedmond says he obtained the directives and contrasted them with an earlier Roman document and "put the two pieces side by side in the paper and asked what's going on, are we more Roman than the Romans". He pointed to some directives which were not included in the press release. These included: temporary structures set in front of the high altar could not be used in any church or oratory, public or semi-public; Holy Communion was to be received kneeling; offertory processions in any church or oratory, public or semi-public, were not permitted; the practice of the Faithful each placing a host in the ciborium on entering the church is not permitted; all musical instruments, other than the organ, were prohibited at church services.

In the report (2/4/69), headed "Dublin priests distressed by directives", McRedmond referred to "puzzlement that no explanation accompanied the directives. This would seem to be called for since most of the practices forbidden in Dublin are permitted generally or for special occasions in other Irish dioceses". He said "the whole tone" of the directives tended to "jar with the corresponding instructions of the Holy See" in a 1967 document.

One of these instructions was that other instruments, as well as the organ, could be permitted.

Dowling, in a letter to the *Irish Independent* next day (3/4/69), took blame for any confusion, saying he selected those items which seemed to him to be "of most interest to the general body of readers". He listed nine other directives which he had not included and to which McRedmond did not refer. Dowling told McRedmond that McQuaid was "greatly saddened". McRedmond believes what upset McQuaid was the suggestion that he was not being fully obedient to Rome, that "he was not implementing the Roman regulation...". Feeney also saw significance in these directives, as, to this point, McQuaid had loyally implemented the liturgical instructions of the Vatican, but "now the decrees allowed a degree of spontaneity and difference from one area to another and John Charles, since it was not a direct instruction, fought against change"(1974:69).

Dowling noted to MacMahon (25/4/69) that letters in the *Irish Independent* on the liturgical reforms had now concluded. An editorial of that day had stated that all letters were published and the vast majority of them were critical, 10 against, four for, and three uncommitted. Dowling said that if over three weeks, only 17 of the 170,000 readers "bothered to write on the subject it seems reasonable to draw certain conclusions"(Ar-46).

In 1970, when *The Irish Times* asked McRedmond, recently dismissed from editorship of the *Irish Independent*, to approach McQuaid with a view to

doing a series of articles, he declined, not in the abrupt fashion of earlier years but, with his own reasons why a proper picture could not be provided. The letter was long and courteous, not McQuaid's usual style:

I fear that your Editor, for all the good intentions that I am willing to allow him in this instance, would give you a quite impossible task. Unless you had access to my private archives you could not describe my episcopate. They will remain closed for long after my death. And they will contain many surprises for those who have already attempted to assess my years as Archbishop of Dublin.

McRedmond offered to show him the articles before publication but he felt that would also be a difficult exercise:

I could not sanction the praise you might think it necessary to apportion. The blame you would find in me, I would as always allow to pass without comment. Both you – and your Editor cannot fail to know that I have never yet answered when I was blamed or even reviled. I do not intend to change. All that side of one's life can be very safely left in the hands of God (Ar-53).

This letter shows a measure of courtesy to *The Irish Times* and to McRedmond that he would not have shown some years earlier. There is a tolerance and sense of engagement with the journalistic reality, even if he still refuses to be interviewed. He would never have allowed "good intentions" to *The Irish Times* in earlier years. However, he held out against giving interviews to the media. When T.P.Hardiman, newly appointed Director General of RTE, in 1968, had suggested an interview, McQuaid was

"most unhappy" and quoted from the appropriate section of *The Imitation of Christ* on "anonymity in the doing of the Almighty's work"(Horgan 2004:62).

RETIRAL AND DEATH

Margaret McMahon says McQuaid, on his 75th birthday, got his secretary to bring her over "and have a cup of tea and a piece of his birthday cake, a sponge cake, and he said, 'You know, I officially retired today'"(RTE Television 1998b). The new regulation, brought in after the Council, was that all bishops must offer their resignation to the Pope at the age of 75, but he was not obliged to accept it. There were several Irish bishops older than McQuaid who had been allowed to stay on.

Lehane says McQuaid always referred to his 'retiral' rather than 'retirement', indicating that his retirement was not voluntary. O'Carroll (RTE Television 1998b) said McQuaid told him: "I didn't retire. I was retired".

The archives show the sequence of events from McQuaid's resignation letter of July 1970, to 27/12/71, the thirty-first anniversary of his consecration as Archbishop, when Nuncio Alibrandi called to his door to say the Pope had accepted his resignation, Fr. Dermot Ryan was his successor, and the announcement would be made the following week.

When Diarmuid Martin, now Archbishop of Dublin, but then studying in Rome, was returning from Dublin in May 1970, McQuaid gave him letters for Cardinal Villot, Secretary of State and for Mgr. Benelli, number two in the Secretariat of State. He did not post them because there had been a postal strike in Italy. The Villot letter (23/5/70) enclosed a greeting to the Pope on the 50th anniversary of his ordination as a priest and a copy of McQuaid's pastoral letter on the subject. The covering letter to the Pope was a strong declaration that everything was all right in Dublin, the Faith was safe and the priests and laity were loyal to the Pope, so he need not worry. The pastoral for the Pope's jubilee, published in full in *L'Osservatore Romano*, said those who knew Paul VI "of one accord bear witness to the depth of divine faith that is the mainspring of his thought and word and action":

...Like the Son of God on earth, it has been his lot to be misrepresented, opposed, reviled and even hated. But is it not the promise of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, that the servant shall not be greater than his Master, and that men shall hate His faithful Apostles and disciples"? (Ar-18).

The Benelli letter (23/5/70) offered £10,000 for the reconstruction of the Papal Nunciature in Dublin: "I shall see to it that the necessary funds will not be wanting. It is just one way of expressing to His Holiness my gratitude for a fatherly kindness that has never failed me"(Ar-18). McQuaid sent the cheque to Alibrandi (24/5/70). The money was eventually returned as it was decided not to rebuild the Nunciature but to relocate to nearby premises (Ar-18).

Some have interpreted these letters as a tactic to prepare the Pope for the resignation offer two months later. The Dublin satirical journal, *Phoenix* (15/8/03) described Martin as “the conduit for the beleaguered McQuaid’s unsuccessful countermove to prevent his removal which came 18 months later”. This might be an exaggeration in fact, if not in intention. Martin did not meet Villot or Benelli on this occasion.

As McQuaid approached his 75th birthday, Dowling had media queries as to possible retirement and told McQuaid (21/7/70) he had been approached by all three Dublin daily papers: “You will be aware of my response to all such enquiries: no comment. On being asked for my personal opinion, as I was, I replied that any such speculation on my part would be highly improper”. McQuaid noted (21/7/70): “I fear I should regard any personal inquiry about my life as a grave intrusion, in very bad taste indeed. I have scrupulously refrained from making any inquiry into the personal life of journalists”(Ar-50).

On return from vacation, Benelli (8/8/70) acknowledged McQuaid’s letter: “Your Grace’s accompanying letter addressed to Our Holy Father has already been handed to His Holiness. With pleasure I shall be delighted to see Your Grace when you come to Rome next month”. This letter to the Pope was clearly the offer of resignation (Ar-18).

Newspapers (13/11/69) had reported an audience of the previous year at which Pope Paul had given McQuaid a gold and ivory chalice “in testimony

of his fraternal benevolence and very grateful esteem". Some interviewees mistakenly remembered this as the Pope's way of saying the resignation had been accepted, but it was eight months before the resignation letter. It may, however, have been a hint from the Pope as to what was to come (Ar-18).

Confirmation that McQuaid had submitted his resignation came through an indiscretion by Fr. Daniel O'Connell, SJ, a schoolfriend from Clongowes days, and then recently retired as head of the Vatican Observatory, but still President of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences. Commins to McCann (11/11/70):

"...[Fr. O'Connell] told me, in confidence, that Archbishop McQuaid, while here in Rome on a private visit in September last, did in fact offer his resignation to the Pope on the grounds of having reached the age of 75, and that it was declined. This presumably because of his obviously undiminished vigour, physical capacity and competence to continue the administration of the Archdiocese of Dublin for, maybe, a long time yet. Fr. O'Connell, who has been a very close and intimate friend of his for the past 40 or so years at least, told me he had this information from the Archbishop himself. Archbishop McQuaid does not appear to have let anything of this be known to anyone else here and that is in character since as you know he is extremely reserved" (Ar-4).

Despite what McQuaid apparently told O'Connell, the resignation had been accepted and he had been told so. Nuncio Alibrandi consulted him as to a suitable successor, writing (18/12/70), "*sub secreto pontificio*":

Following our recent conversation I should be most grateful if Your Excellency would be so kind as to give me the names of three outstanding priests whom you would consider suitable for the Archdiocese. As this communication is under the Pontifical Secret, may I ask Your Excellence to return the letter with your reply (Ar-23).

The original letter was not returned by McQuaid.

Alibrandi wrote again (11/1/71), "*sub secreto pontificio*":

The Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Bishops, Cardinal Confalonieri directed me to inform Your Excellency that the Holy Father has praised the spirit of faithful submission and supernatural adherence to God's will, with which you received the communication concerning the acceptance of your retirement. His Holiness willingly accedes to your wishes in this matter and has ordered that the news should not be made public until after the next Synod of Bishops (Ar-23).

Villot told McQuaid (12/1/71) the Pope had instructed "you be allowed to continue to govern your archdiocese until after the forthcoming session of the Synod of Bishops"(Ar-23).

McQuaid had already told Finbar Ryan about the extra year being allowed to him, but might have led him to believe it could be longer, as Ryan wrote (19/12/70):

To borrow an image from Péguy, the months of 1970 have slipped through our hands like slippery eels, so that here we are again at Christmas and the beginning of an ominous new year. Need I say how much I wish and pray for your happiness at Christmas and for your fortitude in 1971 and after (Ar-16).

McQuaid was possibly worried that the Pope's rapid acceptance of his resignation was a negative judgement on his work. Lehane does not remember McQuaid ever being ill, so that was another reason for surprise that his resignation was accepted.

The 'retiral' features strongly in Lehane's recollections and correspondence with McQuaid's friend, Dr. Stafford Johnson. Lehane says Stafford Johnson told him McQuaid was on edge every morning during these eighteen months, waiting for the 11 am post from Europe. "It was like a sword of Damocles hanging over his head". He didn't want to retire, but was prepared to accept it in obedience. McQuaid continued to visit Rockwell after retiral, where Lehane, as President, hosted him and he told Lehane he "did not do any juggling" to have his retiral deferred.

Battelle believes there was a "push to get the resignation accepted" and a lot of people felt that change "had to come, but a lot of us felt a bit sore at the way it did come about, in the sense that we felt that the man was toppled in the end, that there was clique in the diocese". The name most often mentioned as part of the clique was Dermot Ryan, Chairman of the Diocesan Council of Priests, and Professor of Eastern Languages at

University College, Dublin (UCD). He was believed to be the popular choice for next Archbishop. Ward agrees Ryan was in favour of change and that priests also saw James Kavanagh as a suitable successor. Kavanagh was Professor of Social Science in UCD and, later, an Auxiliary Bishop of Dublin. Father C says there was a push and he was asked to become involved, but declined. Dermod McCarthy also agrees about the push and believes McQuaid had "suspicions" about it but never thought his resignation would be accepted. "He couldn't believe it, that he who was archbishop of the most Catholic city in the world...". Fehily agrees about the push and that Ryan was one of the people who spoke strongly about the need for a new Archbishop". Fehily and Ryan were close friends and former seminary classmates. Fehily says Ryan "was incapable of doing anything underhand; he would never have thought of doing that, but he felt that it was time for change".

Soon before McQuaid resigned, Gallagher got a phone call from a young priest

"...and he said to me, 'Vincent, you are very closely associated with Drumcondra, I advise you to try and disconnect yourself as quickly as you can from that connection because the young priests' association are gunning for the old, outgoing archbishop'. I thought it was very strange...That was my first insight into...the infighting within the Church...I thought it was very strange. And unchristian, uncharitable."

Murray says people knew over those eighteen months that change was coming. He does not think there was "a kind of agitation to get him to go. I would say they all knew it was coming", but there would have been "a certain concern" about who might replace him. Murray remembers how, at short notice, McQuaid opened the new Mater Dei buildings in December 1971 and within a month he was gone: "I think he had a hint". Murray believes McQuaid expected to be left in office for another few years.

Cooney's account supports Murray's view that the move was not against McQuaid, as all believed he was going anyway, but on who might be his successor. Cooney is critical of Ryan's role, saying he "posed as a liberal in the Priests' Council to attract the support of the middle ground and the younger priests, and a campaign to promote him as McQuaid's successor had been led by priests such as Peter Lemass and Joe Dunn, who were well versed in communications"(1999b:426-7). Gaughan was "disgusted" when he learnt that McQuaid, after he tendered his resignation in 1970, "had been undermined from within, in a disloyal and underhand fashion, by persons who were determined to ensure who would succeed him"(2000:101).

Feeney (1974:74) reported that Alibrandi surveyed "a wide number" of priests in early 1971 and "a large majority" of the younger ones favoured a change of bishop, a view not shared by many of the city's parish priests. The majority of these younger priests favoured Ryan, with Kavanagh in second place. They made it clear they did not want Carroll whom McQuaid saw as his "heir-apparent". Feeney says "this must have been a bitter blow for Dr.

McQuaid and, in the end, the results of the survey were kept from him". It is difficult to see how the results might have kept from him as versions were published in *The Irish Times* and *Evening Herald* (26/3/71) with Horgan (*The Irish Times*), hinting at names, not necessarily in order of choice, as Ryan, Bishop Herlihy (of Ferns) and Archbishop Sean Gordon (Apostolic Delegate in Africa). In the late 1960s, UCD Ethics lecturer, Fr. Bertie Crowe, who shared a house with Ryan at 148 Stillorgan Road, Dublin, gave me the three names (the *terna*), officially lodged with the Nuncio, as Kavanagh, Herlihy and Gordon. Also, Fr. Paul Tabet, in the Nunciature, noted Horgan's article to McQuaid (26/3/71) expressing sorrow that "such a delicate question should, once again, be a subject matter for the Press"(Ar-23).

Retiral

McQuaid behaved as normal from 27/12/71 to mid-day, 4/1/72, when the Nuncio released the statement that the Pope had accepted the resignation and appointed Ryan as Archbishop. Murray tells how McQuaid himself announced it:

"...he had a meeting with the vicars general at 11 o'clock. The meeting proceeded as normal, apparently. Then he said the Angelus and said: 'The new Archbishop is waiting outside the door'...That was extraordinary. But it was typical of him. He conducted the meeting as if nothing had happened...He told Dermot Ryan to come to Archbishop's House at noon [by the postern gate, but Ryan did not know what a postern gate was, so had to ask the way!]...."

MacMahon concedes McQuaid was "a little" disappointed, but "never expressed his disappointment to me". He says McQuaid would see his retirement in terms of obedience, "that the Holy Father had accepted his resignation, that was the will of God for him. And he might not have spent that much time worrying about it...I felt he had a grip of things right up to the end". MacMahon says McQuaid must have felt it coming "because he did get an extension of a year or so". This is the only confirmation in the interviews that McQuaid was given the extra year.

Lehane remembers McQuaid saying: "I will enthrone the new Archbishop and then I will disappear completely. The next few years will be tough and perhaps I would not have been able for them. Perhaps I would let the Church down". Lehane remembers, shortly afterwards, asking McQuaid for advice about something, and his reply was: "There was a time when I could have helped you but remember I am in the vaults, in the vaults entirely".

Fagan heard diocesan priests remarking that McQuaid resented the way the Church was going: "His time was over. He was very surprised and disappointed that his resignation was accepted in Rome...He gave the impression that he was so sure that his huge diocese was so well run that it was a model for others". For Battelle, "it broke his heart" and Murray says "it was a sad end, in a way". Lehane believes the Nuncio handled it badly because he informed McQuaid on the anniversary of his consecration.

Finbar Ryan's great disappointment at his own retirement through ill-health in 1966, and his return to Ireland in great gloom, would have affected McQuaid's foreboding of what might lie ahead of him. There was no close friend, apart from Ryan, to tell McQuaid what it would be like. Ryan wrote (16/6/66):

"You have been so long my friend and confidant that it is right you should be among the first to know of my resignation, accepted propter aetatem et infirmitatem [because of age and infirmity]...You, better than anyone, will understand my distress at seeming to fail the Church at this crucial time here, and I can not free myself from the anxiety as to what may happen under a new regime...P.S. I die at noon Roman time on Saturday, 18th (Ar-16).

Ryan hated retirement, "I die". He believed he could not be done without and feared those whom he did not favour would take over and ruin all he had done. McQuaid would have reflected on this as his own time approached.

In August 1966, Ryan, now back in Cork, wrote:

"...I find it difficult to adjust myself to such a circumscribed and seemingly aimless life. My departure from Port of Spain was unspectacular but not without a feeling that personally, I had failed God, and that deservedly I was being taken from the people of my love. This I have said to nobody but yourself!" (Ar-16).

To the end

Dermot Ryan was ordained Archbishop by the Pope, in Rome, and came back to Dublin for his installation, in the Pro-Cathedral, 27/2/72. McQuaid administered the diocese until then. Battelle, then a curate in the Pro-Cathedral, remembers McQuaid that day: "When I was helping him with his vestments, he said: 'Father, Father, they didn't want me'. Battelle says McQuaid was "very hurt" and that "he put on his coat and walked out the back door" and didn't stay for the reception. Father A, seeing retirement as "the worst thing that ever happened" to McQuaid, confirms this story. Gallagher continued to visit McQuaid in retirement. Dunn never met McQuaid in retirement and wrote (1986:35):

...it's something I still feel badly about. He moved quite suddenly from a position of great power and activity to one where he was powerless, unemployed, and semi-ostracised. Rightly or wrongly some seemed to suggest that to call at Killiney, where John Charles lived, might be taken as a symbol of opposition to the new regime. So I decided to wait a little.

One close friend of McQuaid says he felt the transition from a very busy pastoral schedule of work to the experience of the inactivity of retirement. But he had inner reserves which supported him". He agrees McQuaid felt lonely in retirement because he was a quiet person by style and he never socialised as such.

In that year he was thinking a lot of death, as shown in his remarks to Fehily about his fear of dying and facing judgement. Fehily visited McQuaid weekly during retirement. He talks of

“the integrity of the man, he was lonely, he never complained about anything, he never said, ‘nobody visits me’ or that, he never said, ‘how is the new archbishop getting on’, or ‘how are things in the diocese’ ...He never mentioned anything to do with the diocese.”

Fehily says McQuaid only came to ceremonies if he was invited, and “he rarely was invited. I would imagine he was very hurt...I don’t think Dermot [Ryan] visited him much, if at all...”. Moloney was another who remained close and McQuaid visited him and the other priests at the Pro-Cathedral and had meals with them: “He used to enjoy that in a simple kind of way”. Butler talks of McQuaid’s great faith. He had a few letters from him after retirement, and “I don’t think he was ever disillusioned...possibly, I would say, he was a bit disappointed”.

The *Sunday Press*, in March/April 1973, ran a series of articles on the Dublin Archdiocese by John Kelly, with one, 1/4/73, criticising the state of the finances and suggesting McQuaid had been reckless in overburdening the diocese with debt to build new churches and other developments. There was not any suggestion of dishonesty. Lehane says McQuaid was “deeply upset”. He was not to read the next two articles for, on the morning of Saturday, 7/4/73, he had a heart attack, was taken to hospital and died. Lehane says Dr. Stafford Johnson attributed “the unexpected heart attack”

to the articles, "because they were not contradicted". He says Stafford Johnson told him in a letter in 1978: "It was the trigger that brought about his death and no doubt God had his own designs on this. I have his own annotated copy [of the articles]".

Cooney (1999b:431) learnt from O'Carroll that McQuaid was "so distressed" that he went to Barrett and said "it is putting my whole period in office in question". Barrett advised him to do nothing because the media would seize upon any statement.

Connell believes McQuaid was treated "very unfairly". He himself was "deeply hurt" at the way "a great man had been attacked":

But, I was a friend of Dermot Ryan and I could speak openly to him. I said to him, not attacking him, because I was quite convinced that he hadn't inspired them [the articles], I said: 'Your predecessor always did the dignified thing. There was only one dignified thing to do on this occasion, and that was to die, and the Lord permitted him to do so.

And this was McQuaid's final answer to his critics.

9: RELATIONSHIP INDICATORS

THIS CHAPTER, following Ledingham, Bruning and other authors, examines the indicators of the relationships, of which the antecedents and expectations before the Council were considered in Chapter 5. It finds that, between archbishop and priests, there was an emphasis on trust, as shown in loyalty and obedience, mixed with fear and awe, which priests of all ages and positions seemed to have for McQuaid. Other indicators were formality, remoteness and McQuaid's certitude and his difficulties with consultation and dialogue. The strongest indicators in the archbishop-laity relationships were his remoteness and invisibility, as well as formality, paternalism, awe and, even from a distance, fear. The basic indicators in the priests-laity relationships were reverence and deference as Biever's research demonstrated but he also found complaints that priests were often cold and aloof towards people. These indicators show the contrast between the public and the private McQuaid, with severity on one hand and outstanding personal kindness to the poor and needy on the other.

ARCHBISHOP AND PRIESTS

Trust

Trust on both sides was an indicator of McQuaid's relationships with his priests, but trust was not always the word used. Greene: "He trusted people...If you were a professional on a particular job, then he trusted you

implicitly" and Butler: "Trust was terribly important...He trusted me absolutely and that trust I never violated". Fehily stresses confidentiality and says if something was very personal for a priest, McQuaid would meet him away from his office.

Loyalty and obedience

Priests stress mutual loyalty as a strong feature of the relationship with McQuaid. Butler says the priests, in general, were "a loyal group" and despite the fact that many of them mightn't 'love' McQuaid, they 'respected' him. Gaughan says "he was tremendously loyal to his priests, and that meant they were loyal to him". Murray also testifies to the priests' loyalty, but is not sure to what extent it was a personal loyalty...". Battelle says they criticised McQuaid and were often unhappy with him, but "all had a loyalty to him". Dermot McCarthy says his late uncle, Sean Carey, a parish priest, felt to the end that McQuaid was "perfectly right in everything he did. He had a huge loyalty". Gallagher remembers Bertie Canon McKernan, a priest in the 1960s, whose "admiration for McQuaid was absolute, he could see no wrong in McQuaid". Ward, asked if McQuaid got a high degree of loyalty from his priests, replied that "he got a high degree of obedience", and this was a sort of "ours-not-to-reason-why" style of obedience.

Fear

Stack says many older, as well as younger priests, were "terrified" of McQuaid: "There was this air about him. It might have been a filial fear...I know priests who were summoned to his presence for not wearing a hat,

and they were terrified". This fear often came from their student days. However, Stack does not believe there was a "regime of terror", their faith and understanding of the Church and what they were at meant they did not construe it in that way: "We weren't going around neurotically worried all the time about the archbishop...life went on...". Butler found "people were inclined to be a bit scared of him". Greene knew McQuaid well, and was not fearful of him, "but I would watch my Ps and Qs".

Brophy's parish priest in Donnybrook was Fr. Cyril P. (Paddy) Crean, a Second World War chaplain who had been on the beaches in Normandy, "and people like that could still be made quake in their boots when the archbishop came...". Gill remembers Edward Canon Gallen, the ecclesiastical censor, was "absolutely terrified of the archbishop". Foyle plays down the element of fear: "They were part of the same mould...they knew what his style was and how to keep on the right side of him". The Public Image Committee (24/1/64) considered that, while priests respected McQuaid, "they are afraid of him, even some parish priests"(Ar-61).

Fr. Joe Dunn, through Radharc, had regular dealings with McQuaid and:

I became fond of him. I got on well with him, relatively speaking and judging by some of the stories that other priests tell. I'm also grateful to him because I owe him a lot. That said, I must also say that there was no man that I feared more. He exercised absolute power over his priests which nobody in their right mind would dare question (1986:25).

Awe

Dermod McCarthy remembers "a sense of great awe going into the presence of this man" and when he swept through the Pro-Cathedral or the corridors of Clonliffe, "with his black cloak just touching the ground...it was a rather awesome sight". McCarthy remembers how, even in a friendly meeting, this sense of awe put one on the defensive, "he had gimlet eyes and I can see him sitting behind the desk, gently touching his hands together and asking questions in an unusual way...". Murray speaks of "a bit of awe" in his relationship with McQuaid and that one would be "uneasy" with him. He believes many priests shared that awe. Greene says Fr. Joseph Carroll, later President of Clonliffe College and Auxiliary Bishop, always referred to McQuaid as the "High Command" and would say, "never offend the High Command". Awe could become "obsequiousness" and Gaughan says some priests went so far that it became embarrassing. He sees it as a "black mark" against McQuaid and a "touch of vanity" that he allowed it. Dermod McCarthy found it "quite revolting" in some of the older priests. He tells a story of McQuaid in Clonliffe, addressing a gathering of volunteer helpers returned from the diocesan pilgrimage to Lourdes, and how Mgr. John O'Regan, Pilgrimage Director, in introducing him, gave a most dramatic display of bending and bowing and arm-swinging with "unctuous repetition of 'Your Grace' and numerous compliments to him after every second sentence". O'Regan was Diocesan Chancellor and his style is seen in a letter to McQuaid in Rome (10/10/62):

Your Grace's departure to attend the General Council was a very proud and stirring occasion, but it left a sense of personal loss and the consciousness that Your Grace would not be immediately available to help by your unerring judgements in the many problems which each day brings to the Chancellery. Your absence makes us realise more clearly how much we are all accustomed to depend on your kindness, patience and firm direction (Ar-67).

Formality and remoteness

Fehily says the closer one was to McQuaid, the more formal he was and it was always "Your Grace", and he gave his reason:

'Father, if you ever became intimate with me, then we would not be able to discuss things, because if you were in an intimate situation you might forget who you are speaking to and you might make a derogatory remark about somebody which might harm him in my opinion'.

Several priests say they hardly knew McQuaid and never had conversation with him, a remoteness which helped to build the impression of a gulf between them. Curtin, never close, but remembering McQuaid from Blackrock College, believes he "changed on becoming Archbishop and became more remote". Father C remembers him as "a remote, austere figure to everybody", remoteness from the junior priests enhanced by the impersonal approach that was a common feature of society at the time.

Some refer to meeting McQuaid when he visited their parishes for confirmations. Battelle says these meetings were individual and "you could

have your say". Others felt inhibited because McQuaid was checking performance and paperwork. Gaughan would have been "as reticent about seeing him as he would have been about me, because I didn't want to talk with him". However, Gaughan once confronted him over his parish priest's accusation that his work was unsatisfactory. Gaughan challenged the points made against him but McQuaid seemed to doubt his word. They both became angry and the meeting ended abruptly. McQuaid did not let down the parish priest but soon after moved Gaughan to a new appointment which was clearly a promotion.

Fehily recalls McQuaid's precision about paperwork:

"...he examined the books in the sacristy ...and he would say, 'why did you make that call here, Father', or, 'you must have been in a hurry because you wrote the names of the children but you don't have the dates of their birth'...And then he would take out his pen and he would write the date and 'J.C.McQuaid', and he had it checked every year."

Ward did not have problems with him and the relationship became "in some way personal" when McQuaid asked him to go to Liverpool to study "this new subject" - sociology-empirical. And that turned into a PhD. Ward says:

I wrote to him at the insistence of the Professor of Social Science, the head of the Department there [Liverpool University], saying that he thought that I should continue and take another year to do a PhD.

And the reply I got was: 'My dear Father Ward, you have heard of the proverb not to lose the ship for the sake of a hap'orth of tar; in God's name proceed to a PhD'.

McQuaid's certitude

McQuaid's desire for certitude created imbalance even in private conversation. Battelle says he "would lead the conversation...You never got the last word" and tells of a visit to Arklow for confirmations when McQuaid had read a book beforehand about the tides in the local Avonmore river. He "pontificated" on it for the entire dinner and nobody could contradict him because he was right. Greene says McQuaid once challenged Fr. Con Lee about the specifics of a camera and others around the table believed he was "chancing his arm". Next day they asked a camera expert who said McQuaid was "dead on". Father B remembers McQuaid coming to Clonliffe for dinner with the staff, sitting at the top of the table and dictating the flow of conversation: "You would think he had read an encyclopedia before he came over because he really was an expert in everything". The staff would sit listening and seldom expressing any views. Murray says McQuaid regarded a conversation as "a battle of wits which he always won" and how "he would finish a conversation with a killer blow in which he would sum up the thing. And he was usually right, there was nothing more to be said". If he were caught out he would change the topic "fairly sharply". In contrast, Tim Pat Coogan found McQuaid "most interesting" in conversation, especially on topics like Northern Ireland and international affairs (15/2/06). He confirms, however, there were certain "doors one did

not attempt to press open", for example, ecumenism, Trinity College, censorship, contraception (Coogan 1973:6). McQuaid admitted to Whyte that he could appear learned by reading book reviews and repeating what they said (Ar-82).

Gaughan sees McQuaid's insistence on leading the conversation with his priests as "a little vanity that he had, that no matter whatever topic came up, he knew everything about it, and if he didn't, he came up with some extraordinary comment on it...". Brophy says the "worst thing you ever did with him was to show that you might know something better than he did". Lehane says one let McQuaid raise conversational topics, but he did not like anybody to argue or contradict. When MacMahon was asked if McQuaid would ever say, 'I don't know anything about that', he replied: "No, he would never say that".

McQuaid's certitude made it hard for him to apologise, as seen in his response to Burke Savage's accusation that he publicly blamed him for the embarrassment of the Mansion House meeting (Ar-79). Nor did McQuaid apologise in 1968 when he ordered two journalists, Peadar Cearr, *Cork Examiner*, and Denis Coghlan, *The Irish Times*, to leave a meeting of teaching nuns, demanding, without success (in my presence, as *Irish Press* reporter who had arrived late), that Coghlan hand over his notes. Dowling had invited the press at the request of Mother Jordana, organiser of the event, and it was he who was made to apologise (Ar-45).

McQuaid's certitude went with deep-rooted attitudes developed during his teaching years. He was "a headmaster...we were all his children and he was going to look after us"(Stack). "He wasn't a person you could have a personal chat with because he was too didactic..."(Gaughan).

Telling him the truth

These features may have led priests, and others, to tell McQuaid not the full truth but only what they thought he wanted to know. However, he told the Public Image Committee (24/1/64) they were not to hold back anything in their report. As MacMahon reported him:

There was no use asking people for an opinion unless they could feel free to give it. They were not to think that anything they felt ought to be said would hurt. It would not. His Grace reminded the meeting of their duty to point out anything that is defective because if they did not they must render an account for it at their judgement"(Ar-61).

Burke Savage, on being blamed for the Mansion House embarrassment (30/9/66), wrote:

...unlike many of your own clergy and laity, I was never two-faced, saying what you wanted to hear in your presence and cutting you to ribbons behind your back. Nor could it ever be said that I tried to serve you for any base motive, as Your Grace's friendship could not do anything for me as it could for your own clergy (Ar-57).

McQuaid (2/10/66) was indignant:

For my clergy and laity 'who tell me what they think I want to know and cut me to ribbons behind my back', I do not know these persons, fortunately. Treachery is inherent in the clergy since the days of Our Divine Redeemer. But I can say this: The amount that I receive from clergy or laity that could be called even consoling is very small; the amount that is laudatory extremely small. I can indeed deceive myself, but not all the time, more especially as I am acutely aware that judgement cannot be distant (Ar-79).

When Otto Herschen of *The Catholic Herald* told McQuaid he disagreed with the decision to remove modernistic figures from the Christmas crib at Dublin Airport church, McQuaid replied: "I am glad you disagree. Everyone else agrees with whatever I say"(quoted P.McGarry 2004).

Listening, dialogue and consultation

Dialogue was not a word McQuaid liked. When Christopher Aliaga Kelly, a Catholic layman, sent copies to each bishop of a lecture he had given on the Church, McQuaid replied: "Thank you for courtesy. Your article is well-balanced, but I am sorry that you use the jargon of Establishment and dialogue"(Ar-11). Finbar Ryan told McQuaid (3/8/62) of his difficulties with his own clergy in Trinidad because of the age gap and he referred to dialogue as that "horrible current-word"(Ar-16). MacMahon saw McQuaid as "always prepared to listen to a reasonably presented case! Indeed he had a number of good friends, whose judgement he trusted, who were in no way part of Archbishop's House"(1998:389).

Interviewees are generally negative on McQuaid's approach to consultation.

Lovatt-Dolan: "...a first-class manager...[consultation] not much... [advisers] yes...[did he consult with them?] yes, he did...[did he follow their advice?] I think he probably did because he chose them very carefully. He had people all over the place". Battelle: "...very much surrounded by men who would praise him" and they influenced him because they included people whom he had appointed in charge of various commissions. Fehily believes McQuaid was not always his own master because he had to have advisers and sometimes they advised him "maybe in a too conservative or careful way". MacMahon agrees he would draw upon expert advisers, but wouldn't necessarily discuss with anyone

the full ambit of what he was about. I would say he would consult where consultation was necessary because he was a very fine administrator and a very good diplomat, but he wouldn't necessarily confide to everybody what his overall strategy or support was.

Battelle believes the secretaries, "certainly Mgr. MacMahon, had a very great influence with him. Mgr. MacMahon sold a lot of ideas to him...Basically, when you produced a scheme for him, you had to, in a way, make him think it was his own idea". Father C agrees that if "you wanted something done you had to make sure the boss thought it was his idea" and that this applied not just to the Archbishop but to curates in dealing with parish priests.

ARCHBISHOP AND LAITY

Remote and invisible

Burke Savage told the Public Image Committee (24/1/64) that people who had the opportunity of meeting and speaking with McQuaid "have had their attitude transformed. His Grace cannot meet everybody in the Diocese, but somehow he must go out to the people...". MacMahon noted that McQuaid would not like to be recommended to take on the kind of role that would be foreign to his temperament and had said his successor "could very well be a Pope John type".

The Committee reported the view of lay people that "our Bishops are very remote" and suggested "a positive image" might be assisted by "the cumulative effect of little things such as sedulous meeting of parents after confirmation, appearing informally on television, allowing informal press photographs and in general, in so far as is possible, by dropping the formal manner". They were clearly referring to McQuaid. The draft report was more direct, recommending that "to create a true image of his character and his work", McQuaid should try to meet the people "at Church functions and public gatherings", and write pastoral letters which are "short and simple" and give "positive personal leadership to the faithful in matters of public concern"(Ar-61).

Scott had "cursory meetings" with McQuaid, but "really, my overall concept is that he was mostly invisible...and that remained to the end". Brophy

contrasts McQuaid with Paddy Dunne, his Auxiliary Bishop, who was at ease with everybody. Brophy says "there didn't seem to be any human warmth" in McQuaid, and that was why Dubliners "loved" Dunne, "because he wasn't afraid to pay his fare in the tram, and that was what they missed [in McQuaid who was always driven]". Lehane says McQuaid once told him he "never crossed a door socially in Dublin in thirty years".

Formal

Gill says Willie, his father, as a near contemporary of McQuaid and as his publisher, had never anything but "a very, very cold relationship" and was "never comfortable in his presence, there was never a meeting of equals". He always felt "intimidated by him and he was never at ease...". Murray agrees McQuaid's relationships with the laity would have been "quite formal", but, in a sense, he blames the people also, that a lot of it would have been their own doing and because of what their expectation of a bishop was: "It is very hard to have dialogue with people if all they are interested in is kissing your ring and genuflecting and finding out in which order you do those things...". Fehily says McQuaid was a "wonderful person" but "he wouldn't have that very particular gift of relating in a friendly way with parishioners...".

Paternalistic

The Public Image Committee (1964) commented that

bishops do not seem to be sufficiently conscious of the maturity and high standard of general education of many of our lay Catholics. Hence they at times offend them by treating them as if they were immature and uneducated. As a result of this lay people tend to adopt an attitude of destructive criticism rather than identifying themselves with the bishops in meeting contemporary difficulties (Ar-61).

Louis and Maeve McRedmond describe McQuaid's relationship with the laity as "paternal". Louis talks of church architecture and how McQuaid allowed "hideous" churches to be built because he didn't want to upset his people with change. Maeve believes he didn't want the laity to be thinking for themselves. It was generally agreed that McQuaid was very protective towards 'his people' but with a gentle paternalism. The old Lenten Fast prescribed how much one could eat and how often during the 40 days of Lent. It was binding on all between the ages of 21 and 60 unless given a dispensation by a priest for health or other reasons. Greene recalls that McQuaid tended to be lenient about the fast and once told his priests that as confessors they were "too strict on penitents". Mgr. Owen Sweeney, on the other hand, recalls a parishioner in Co. Wicklow, who had had a major stomach operation and could only take small snacks, and when he asked McQuaid for a dispensation for this person from the Communion fast, he refused because he had not authority to allow it.

Feeney (1974:5) saw McQuaid as an administrator "who was somewhat wont to treat people as though they needed to be protected and disciplined

like children". Fuller (2002:9), believes the bishops saw themselves "as father figures protecting their flock". Cardinal Ratzinger, later Pope Benedict XVI, commenting in 1966 on the fourth session of Vatican II, said the Church "lives from the faith of those who are simple at heart", who are the "most precious treasure of the Church"(cited in Allen 2000:262).

Loyalty and awe

The laity were generally loyal to McQuaid, but, like the priests, they felt they had no choice and their culture was to be loyal to the bishop, whoever he was. Stack felt "we were all in this thing together", but for the laity it was combined with a fear from a distance, not like the priests' sense of fear. Lovatt-Dolan says he trusted people when he asked them to do something: "I never had the feeling that he was breathing down my neck...". For Gill, lay people tended to display the same subservience as many of the priests. Gallagher says lay people "regarded him with a certain amount of awe which was aided and abetted by some senior priests".

PRIESTS AND LAITY

Reverence and deference

Reverence and deference on the part of the laity and a certain superiority among some priests who still felt they were better educated, had been traditional indicators in the priests/laity relationship, but this was beginning to change in the 1960s. Fallon (1999:186) sees "priest-worship",

strong over many years, as mainly a female characteristic with clerical celibacy "an important, even essential ingredient in it".

The Public Image Committee (1964) noted lay criticism that the priests were not sufficiently accessible" and were neglecting parish visitation, which "plays an irreplaceable part in the welding together of priest and people and in the building up of a parochial spirit". On the accusation that "priests lack consideration for their people", they pointed to the "good percentage" of the people who had now reached the priest's educational and social level and said the clergy could no longer "presume on the deference traditionally accorded to the cloth. Our people are becoming openly critical, and apparent arrogance or ill-manners on the part of the clergy is resented in a new way". They added that "many intelligent laymen feel that the clergy do not know the needs or wants or opinion of the laity"(Ar-61).

Griffin remembers the early 1960s when he served at Whitefriars Street in a city centre parish. In those days the "confessions were enormous. I heard confessions for about seven and a half hours every Saturday...And also the eve of First Fridays, and then Holy Week and Christmas were excruciating. I spent an awful lot of my time hearing confessions". Battelle saw the laity as conservative, but "they were practising and they were happy in the practice of their faith". He found the "mass of the faithful" were non-questioning and many did not even realise there was a Council and it was going to impinge on their own lives.

In 1964, Bruce Biever, an American Jesuit, conducted a quantitative and qualitative study of priests and laity in Dublin city and county. McQuaid supported the project, and some say he suggested, even commissioned it, but he "was not available for interview"(Biever 1965,1976:220). Its most notable feature is lack of reference to Vatican II in either the questions or responses over 522 pages. Biever cites Fr. Kevin Smyth, SJ, (1958:136) on the "intense loyalty of the laymen to their church, their steady generosity, their zeal for the foreign missions, in short, the healthy state of the Church is so obvious that anything like an orgy of self-criticism would be unbalanced and pointless".

Biever (236) found many people "complained of the coldness of the clergy, their aloofness from the laity", but reasserted that they did not wish it otherwise for "comradeship in the church reminded them of Protestantism". When asked if they considered the Church to be 'out of date', 88% disagreed (241), while one respondent said: "When you've got the truth, lad, you don't worry about keeping up with the times"(261). But were they in favour of change? Only two per cent agreed that the Church was "in need of radical transformation to make it relevant to the demands of today's world"(241). One cleric said: "The church is not a tyranny; we act as quickly or as slowly as the people we lead. Why disturb them if they really do not see the need for any change in the *status quo*?"(376).

Biever was embarrassed by the deep-rooted deference when he joined the back of the queue at a public telephone box. The woman in the booth hung

up in the middle of her call, came out and surrendered the phone to him. When he protested, she said: "No priest should be standing in line waiting for the likes of me"(265).

The authority of the clergy featured strongly in Biever's findings, with the people convinced "more than anything else that the clergy are the authority figure in every aspect of their lives, not merely religious, but social, political, economic as well"(270). One priest said no one questioned their authority: "How can they? We have more education, thank God, and with that education comes the responsibility to lead"(229). 92% agreed without reservation and none disagreed that priests "should be given a great deal of respect both by individuals and society"(264). Biever found that 78% of respondents "would like to see their son a priest above and beyond everything else in the world"(268). As to the power of McQuaid, one political figure told Biever: "Put down somewhere in your book that there is not a political decision, not a piece of legislation proposed with hope of passage that has not in some way been cleared at Drumcondra". Others verified this view to him but always "off the record"(397).

Biever felt a lot of reverence for the clergy was really fear: "A single word from the local parish priest can destroy a man's reputation in his community, take away his livelihood, and make him a pariah in his own family"(497). Biever found that anybody speaking out on church-related issues was "viewed with great suspicion by their peers and the clergy alike"(496) and there was little doubt that the Church in Ireland "is at best

indifferent to true intellectualism, at worst hostile to it"(499). Only 40% saw "in the Church an opportunity for free discussion and self-expression"(236).

While the above could indicate that the old power of the Church was still secure in 1964, Biever also spoke of a laity "demanding more and more voice in the councils and decision-making enclaves, more participation in the liturgical forms, more vital incorporation into the life stream of their religious commitment", but it is not clear whether this was a general comment or related specifically to Dublin (434).

10: RELATIONAL CULTIVATION STRATEGIES

THIS CHAPTER looks at the three sets of public relationships, with special attention to the Archbishop's side, to identify strategies which could be seen to have cultivated and improved the relationships, just maintained them or, possibly, damaged them. There is further evidence of McQuaid's ability to mix an authority-driven approach and strict discipline with extreme kindness. Relationships with some specific stakeholder groups are used to illustrate the general points made under each strategy heading, and to identify patterns.

ARCHBISHOP AND PRIESTS

Exercise of authority

McQuaid had definite views on how authority should be exercised in the Church. Reporting the first meeting of the Public Image Committee (24/1/64), MacMahon noted that "the Archbishop announced as a principle that authority cannot give its reasoning". [McQuaid added: "always. The Cabinet does not, nor is it expected".]

Burke Savage said the tendency today is for people to be interested in the reasons for events. The Archbishop: "People must accept decisions because authority has spoken, and not for the reasons behind the decision. This is, of course, because authority is from God, and the voice of authority is the voice of God".

O'Halloran suggested that that was the theory, but life was quite different...Fr. Kavanagh: "We try to show that the Ten Commandments are reasonable". Burke Savage: "The younger clergy are alert and full of interest in social changes and in the changes in the Church, and they need encouragement to avail of the opening the Church can have here"(Ar-61).

The Committee report disagreed with McQuaid:

"Knowledge about the background to public actions and the reasons for the decisions is regarded as a vital step in the creation and maintenance of a public image. Currently people appear to 'need' reasons and background information. When reasons are not known explanations are invented...Currently the leadership role of those in command is very much emphasised. This is to say, it is emphasised that in addition to ruling, those in authority aim at leading their subjects...Such an approach to leadership recommends itself, aiming as it does at a free response. Also, an enlightened obedience appears to be more successful than an unreasoned assent"(Ar-61).

The report quoted Pope Paul (12/2/64) against McQuaid: "Our world does not love authoritarian and dogmatic attitudes" and comments: "When the reasons for obeying are shared with those who are to obey the freedom – and – responsibility aspect of the relationship shows more clearly"(Ar-61).

Interviewees say McQuaid exercised his authority in an 'authoritarian' way. Masterson didn't see him "so much as a manager as a kind of authority". For Fagan, he was "very autocratic and dictatorial. He was always right...No question of dialogue". For Mac Réamoinn, McQuaid was a "very

authoritarian man" and what distinguished him from others was "the sharpness of his pronouncements, that he certainly could say what he was saying very articulately, not in the way that some others would". MacMahon wrote that McQuaid "never seemed to find it necessary to stress his authority. Undoubtedly his strong personality carried with it an innate authority. His direction, in my experience, was sometimes sardonic, but often playful"(1998:389).

Gaughan believes we must see McQuaid "in the time in which he lived". He compares him to de Valera "who was very authoritarian because that was the way things were done at that time." Gay Byrne says "everything was authoritarian, RTE, ESB, Guinness, and the GAA".

McQuaid's exercise of authority was focus for an attack by Desmond Fisher (1967a):

Everywhere I went in Ireland, I was advised even by bishops: 'Don't make the mistake of imagining Dublin is Ireland'. One priest described the regime there as 'Byzantine'. Yet Dublin's Archbishop, John Charles McQuaid, an ascetic-looking prelate with gimlet eyes, is known for his great pastoral zeal and unpublicised charitableness. He is widely criticised for his authoritarianism (though a truer judgement would be that he has a paternalistic attitude which is now totally anachronistic) while still held in the sort of sneaking regard the Irish feel for a man of strong principles however much they disagree with the application of these principles"(Ar-42).

Control and discipline

The word most frequently used in these interviews to describe McQuaid's management of the diocese, of people, and of himself, is "control", even "control-freak" (Horgan, Corish). Clerical and lay interviewees, friends and 'enemies', those close to him and even those who only knew him from a distance, stress this: "Every single thing was controlled by him" (Father B). "He would have been very much the man in control" (Connell). Fagan sees significance in McQuaid's small handwriting which "was always perfect. Tiny. Careful. The impression of control. Very legible and straight".

There were trusted priests and lay people who reported to McQuaid about priests' performance and behaviour and what was happening. Fehily says McQuaid "had ears all over the diocese and he was kept informed by the vicars general and when he visited for confirmation every year". Stack says this network created a strong culture of control and "there was that awful feeling that you could be the victim of any kind of old prejudice".

One priest remembers that McQuaid's messages to them at their annual retreat tended to emphasise discipline with sets of warnings, admonitions and prohibitions and "deprecate" as a recurring word.

Dunn wrote: "Nothing could be done by a priest in Dublin unless it had John Charles' express support or escaped his notice until it was too late. Little did escape his notice" (1986:26). Priests were frequently summoned to him for being seen without hats and this became a symbol of the McQuaid

era, but as with the Trinity College ban, it was a ruling of the Hierarchy. Connell says McQuaid enforced it so rigorously that it was demonstrated as a sign of change when Dermot Ryan, leaving for Rome for ordination as Archbishop, was photographed in the press without a hat. Another symbol of McQuaid's rule was that priests could not have cars without his permission, and Father B says this extended even to Fr. Carroll, President of Clonliffe College, who learnt to drive but was then refused permission to have a car.

Some have said it was the sin rather than the sinner that annoyed McQuaid. Feeney (1974:11) saw this as "delicacy in judging individual frailty and firmness in punishing revolt against Church order". However, if the sin was disobedience it was a different matter. Feeney (1974:85) tells how Fr. Brian Power, a UCD chaplain, was summoned to Archbishop's House and severely reprimanded by McQuaid over accusations which included saying Mass without an altar-stone and saying the Canon of the Mass in English before it had been sanctioned. When Power tried to explain the circumstances and reasons for his behaviour, McQuaid said: "You are a priest of this diocese, Father. I order you to obey". McQuaid then stood up and strode out without another word.

Fehily says McQuaid might "deal very lovingly" with the offending priest in serious matters, while for minor things like being seen out without a hat, it was very different, he could be "very strict". Greene says Fehily told him that one thing you had to watch with McQuaid was "to make sure that your

shoes were clean and they were polished". Father A says "you would nearly have to get into trouble before you could break through the curtain" but if you kept the rules and did your work you never knew him.

McQuaid's efforts to control religious broadcasting have already been described. He told Canon Cathal McCarthy (15/1/62) it would "help TE if it were understood that the text of every Recollection to be given by a Catholic priest must first be submitted to, and passed by you". McQuaid never allowed nuns to appear on television (Ar-25).

Murray says McQuaid trusted those whom he sent to Rome where they could have picked up what he regarded as unorthodox ideas: "We never got any warnings or anything off him". Father B says he brought back ideas from theologians McQuaid would not have approved of and taught them in Clonliffe without interference. Fagan, although not a diocesan priest, enjoyed similar freedom in Mater Dei.

When the Catholic Communications Institute were compiling a statistical profile of the Church in Ireland, McQuaid's suspicion surfaced and before completing the questionnaire, his secretary, Fr. John Fitzpatrick, wrote (24/3/71): "His Grace wishes to know what is the precise use to which the statistics are to be put, if they are to be published, and if so, where and in what form; if they are to be available to people engaged in research, to the press and to television". McQuaid was satisfied with the reply (25/3/71) and the answers were given a week later (Ar-14).

Leadership and administration

McQuaid's imposition of discipline on a loyal and obedient clergy created an efficient administration, but opened his leadership to criticism. The draft report of the Public Image Committee (1964) stated that priests and faithful of the archdiocese "feel that like the rest of the Irish bishops, His Grace does not give them that positive leadership which would give them pride and confidence in their Church"(Ar-61). McQuaid denied he reserved too much control and power to himself, and expressed to Burke Savage (19/1/66) a "fear" that "if I have done one thing in administration it is not to keep all the strings in my hand. I have devolved, as never before, in Dublin, training men, giving them posts and letting them run their work as they see it"(Ar-79).

Gaughan had a high regard for McQuaid because everybody knew where they stood with him, "there was no beating about the bush". Pointing to the small administrative back-up that McQuaid had, compared with the much larger staff that his successor appointed, Connell considers that "Archbishop's McQuaid's administration was good for its time". Battelle says McQuaid "knew nothing about pastoral life", but his management style was characterised by "total efficiency" and "very, very effective". Lehane says McQuaid had a fixed routine even at Rockwell. Every day the bus from Dublin delivered that morning's correspondence, McQuaid dealt with it immediately and the replies were posted that evening. Lehane adds that McQuaid once told him: "Nobody ever opens my correspondence".

Lehane considered McQuaid to be a "superb manager" but "liable to be influenced by opinions of those he trusted" Louis McRedmond saw him as "a superb manager in the sense of keeping the show on the road", but wonders if he was a good manager in "terms of perceiving that this was the best thing for the show". On obedience, Father C says McQuaid had a theory that "if you appointed someone who seemed to be not interested in a job, he would often be the best person to do it".

A courageous and decisive reformer

McQuaid was seen as a reformer, indeed a revolutionary, who led from the front and always had the courage to hold to what he believed was right. Gallagher recalls a priest telling him how McQuaid came in like "an absolute revolution in the archdiocese", immediately reforming the administration and introducing new services for the underprivileged, services which the Government of the day was unable or unwilling to provide. MacMahon believes McQuaid saw Pope Pius XI (1922-39) as a model and that his interest in the social services and related areas was influenced by Pius XI and his social encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931). He says when McQuaid came in, he was "full of this new approach, which was new to Dublin and new to Ireland and he put it into effect", and adds that first decade of his episcopacy was "probably the most effective in that it was revolutionary ". Gaughan had "admiration" for McQuaid because he had "courage and I would put that number one in leadership qualities, moral courage". He adds that McQuaid "didn't care whether he was popular or not. I think that is very brave. You must do the right thing". Louis

McRedmond also respected his courage and consistency, "being honest about things you mightn't agree with him on", and that "you had to give him marks for integrity of that kind". Power says people respected McQuaid for the fact that he "took a very strong line".

MacMahon emphasises McQuaid's decisiveness, taking "full responsibility" with a "hands-on approach". Fehily points to this decisiveness but "he expected you to behave as not the archbishop, he liked you to recognise that he had the ultimate say in what concerned him...". Moloney gives an example of decisiveness when there was a major refurbishment at the Pro-Cathedral, with a new mosaic floor, new confessionals and the organ being rebuilt. McQuaid gave "valuable advice" and, for the rebuilding of the organ said: "The Pro-Cathedral should have a first-class instrument. Invite Professor Anthony Hughes, Oliver O'Brien and Gerard Gillen as consultants".

Strategic foresight and vision

McQuaid had a vision that enabled him to identify issues before others realised their importance. He was, in modern terms, a strategic planner. Burke Savage referred to "his forward looking attitude, his willingness to experiment, his readiness to bring about development, slowly, quietly and patiently in the face of misinformed criticism"(1965b:297).

Moloney praises him for alleviating the acute and widespread poverty in the World War II years by setting up the Catholic Social Service Conference, a

federation of 39 Catholic social groups. This immediately helped a great number of people, right across the diocese in terms of food, clothing, and all the necessities of life. Moloney worked for ten years in the Pro-Cathedral, in one of the poorest districts of the city, and he saw close-up the value of the CSSC, which was administered "by a body of generous apostles, religious and lay". Later, McQuaid set up the Catholic Social Welfare Bureau, which among other things, addressed the welfare of Irish emigrants in Britain. Ward says in terms of social needs, McQuaid was well ahead of everybody, with the politicians years behind, and even the voluntary groups struggling and not able to look beyond current crises to future needs. Other interviewees also praise his foresight: "very farseeing" (Battelle); "a man of great foresight" (Connell); "ahead of his time in a lot of ways" (Lovatt-Dolan); "great foresight, very good planner" (Brophy).

McQuaid tackled issues that others did not anticipate, or preferred to ignore. Lovatt-Dolan and Butler refer to the drugs issue which was supposed not to exist in Dublin, but McQuaid knew it was coming: "He was sending people abroad to learn about drugs and about drug abuse. I know that people were sent long before it became a problem" (Lovatt-Dolan). "He could see it clearly...None of us could see it as he could...he mentioned to me a few times about this menace that was going to overtake our nation in due course" (Butler). The *Sunday Independent* reported (28/2/71) that McQuaid was setting up a unit at St. Anthony's Hospital, Herbert Road, where therapeutic in-patient beds were being installed for the treatment of schoolchildren who had misused drugs, and that he had also purchased two

of the best American films on drug addiction and these were being shown to parents.

Clerical appointments

Some criticised McQuaid for transferring priests suddenly to remote and less desired parishes, as a punishment or sign of his displeasure, with never an explanation, just the formal typed letter. Ward says everyone was moved with six days notice, "that was the norm". Battelle does not see anything unfair about the way appointments were announced: "We were able to take our changes. You got a change on a Monday and you took up your appointment on a Saturday. You never even had time to say goodbye to the people...we never asked for a reason, but you usually had an idea it was coming...". Battelle says McQuaid was "very fair" in the sense that he would give a "graded appointment" to a better position, "not like what happened afterwards, when you could go from 'plum' to 'slum'...". Greene says the system was fair in that "...if he had to haul a priest up over the coals, he might banish him to what we would call 'the sticks'...but after two years he had it in his heart to restore a man to his full dignity...".

Fehily's experience illustrates the negative aspect of the 'intelligence' system, the stern use of the appointments procedure, as well as McQuaid's apparent inability to admit to a mistake. He tells what happened to him after ten years as Director of DICS:

“...he sent for me and he said, ‘In the morning, Father, you are getting a letter from me, changing you...I am sorry to have to say to you that you will not like it...You possibly will say to yourself, ‘this isn’t fair’...and these are his words, not mine, ‘I don’t blame you. You have been ten years a very loyal servant but I am persuaded that this would be best for you’...I was relieved of everything...In the beginning I was a bit shaken...it was published then as a kind of dismissal...”.

Fehily says this was just hours after he had met McQuaid at the airport and McQuaid had whispered: “I have brought you a little present from Rome”. Fehily smiles and says he never got that present, as somebody made a report to McQuaid that evening. It seems he was blamed for some event that went wrong while McQuaid was in Rome, but it turned out that he neither knew of the event nor had anything to do with it. Fehily has his suspicions as to who reported him but will never reveal it. He also believes there was jealousy at the way he had been promoted so young to DICS. He now says the move was “the greatest blessing that I got”. McQuaid told him this was the only time in all his years as Archbishop that he told a priest he was going to be changed before he got the formal letter and said: “I am making an exception as a token of my gratitude”.

The sequel came six months later when Fehily was invited, through his parish priest, Fr. Crean, to meet McQuaid in Killiney. Fehily says McQuaid met him at the door and said:

'Father, before we have lunch may I, will it be all right, if we have a little walk'. And I said, 'Certainly, Your Grace', and he said, 'If I was to say to you, Father, that I have suffered more in the last six months than you have, can we leave it at that', and that was never mentioned again.

Sheehy (2003a:108) refers to this weakness in McQuaid, how "like a capricious dictator, he could also summarily dismiss favoured priests from their posts on the basis of a misunderstanding or in response to false information fed by courtiers the accuracy of which he failed independently to verify".

Kindness to priests

The most frequently mentioned, and most favourable, side to McQuaid's relationships with his priests was kindness to them and their families in sickness and in trouble. There was almost unanimous praise in the interviews: "...always did everything possible to help...in a very quiet, private way..."(Battelle); "...extremely good and extremely kind. One way in which this happened was with the development of laicisation"(Connell); "...an extraordinarily caring person..."(Fehily); "Where someone went to him in trouble, they really got an open door..."(Father A); "If he heard of any sick priest, or any sick friend, or a friend of a priest, or a friend of a friend, he would always go to see them"(Greene).

Lay people also noticed this kindness: "He was awfully good to priests who left the priesthood...very helpful and supportive"(Masterson); "If any priest

wanted to see him, never any problem...he was pastoral and concerned about them, especially when they were ill and...he would make sure they got proper convalescence before they got back into the active ministry" (Lee).

McQuaid preferred to do his good work as secretly as possible. Only those close to him, like his secretaries and his driver, saw the full extent of his visits to hospitals and generous financial help when that was needed. Fagan, however, found some negative reactions when counselling priests "in difficulties, mid-life crises, and wondering about their future". When he asked if they had been to McQuaid with their problems, some would reply

'well, yes' and then say: 'We don't get much satisfaction. If you are prepared to be abject, then nothing is good enough for you. He will give you money, time and space to rest, everything. But, if you are nervous or concerned about your human dignity, it's a different story and, as one of them said, 'if you don't grovel', you are out to Siberia and you can look after yourself'.

A practical demonstration of McQuaid's care of his priests was the introduction of common salary grades, the first bishop in the country to introduce such a measure. It reflected the Public Image Committee's recommendation for an adequate pension scheme for clergy and measures to deal with the disparity in salaries for curates. "Curacies and parishes tend to be judged, not by the scope they offer for apostolic zeal, but solely by a financial consideration: 'How much is it worth?'" (Ar-61).

McQuaid was also solicitous for retired priests. He replied to a Catholic Communications Institute survey (31/3/71): "The Archbishop through the Dublin Diocesan Clerical Fund Society, provides for the financial requirements of the retired priests in this diocese". As to where retired priests now lived, McQuaid, in his own handwriting, responded, "where they choose"(Ar-14).

Favourites

There are indications that McQuaid had favourites among priests and students and that there was an 'inner circle'. Stack says these were people "whom he liked, who could do nothing wrong", while those whom he didn't like, "could do nothing right". Connell backs this up implicitly by pointing out, without prompting, that he was not a "favourite", while Greene says he "wouldn't have been on the inner circle".

Battelle refers to McQuaid's special and trusted friends who were "his eyes and ears". Frequent correspondence shows his long friendship with Archbishop Finbar Ryan and, from 1953, with Burke Savage. Gallagher says Frank Duff, founder of the Legion of Mary, remained a close friend. When asked if those on the "inner circle" remained there, or if people were dropped, MacMahon admits that "one or two, I think", were removed from the inner circle. Battelle remembers fallouts. McQuaid told Whyte he had "never broken with anybody" (Ar-82).

Priestly caution

Diocesan priests, in general, adopted a strategy of caution. Some wrote for *Doctrine & Life* and *The Furrow* and three gave lectures at Milltown Park, but, generally, they kept a low profile. Battelle admits "there were very few priests in the diocese who put their head above the parapet". Griffin says they were a very talented generation of priests, but "kept their heads down" while the more radical members of religious orders got into trouble and their provincials were sent for. Fagan found a lot of priests "who would like to be more liberal but seemed psychologically not free to admit that, as they were afraid they might be reported to the Archbishop".

The Public Image Committee noted this caution:

The fear of a severe rebuke from authority discourages initiatives among priests of the Archdiocese, activity being regarded as a dangerous tendency, passivity as a mark of that prudence which is a safest guarantee of an untroubled passage to good promotion (Ar-61).

Dunn outlined his four-part strategy for dealing with McQuaid: "accept his quasi omniscience...never ask for a decision which you haven't made yourself beforehand...prepare one's chat before any meeting...keep him informed of (nearly) everything". He believed many people failed to strike up a relationship with McQuaid because they were afraid to talk to him (1986:31).

The auxiliary bishops

McQuaid's relationships with his auxiliary bishops seem to have been excellent. Dunne took care of the diocese whenever McQuaid was away but there are examples of McQuaid's annoyance when anybody tried to use these occasions to obtain from the more genial Dunne permissions that he would have refused (Ar-7). Gaughan pays tribute to Dunne, who had been one of the bishop's secretaries in 1940, as "the chief foundation on which John Charles' remarkably successful archiepiscopacy was based" and how Dunne's "exemplary loyalty" on his appointment ensured that of the senior priests. He saw Dunne as "a consummate peace-maker" who settled many personnel problems far from McQuaid's gaze. Such was the contrast between them that McQuaid "was uncomfortable in almost any company, Pat enjoyed all company" (2000:101).

Carroll wrote to McQuaid (11/10/68) the day after his appointment as auxiliary bishop was announced: "I think what I shall remember best is your exquisite thoughtfulness" (Ar-7). Carroll's handwriting was small and controlled, just like McQuaid's. Apparently, he was McQuaid's choice of successor. (The handwriting of Mgr. J.D.Horgan, McQuaid's 'man' in UCD was so identical to McQuaid's that it is nearly indistinguishable).

Archbishop's secretaries

The staff at Archbishop's House rose from just four when McQuaid came into office to 23 in 1969 and they "are all very busy", he told Whyte (Ar-82). Central to the administration was his small team of priest-secretaries

specialised in areas like education, personnel and finance. They have rarely spoken about their relationships with him. MacMahon, secretary from 1957 to 1974, participated in this research, but marked the limits of what he could say because of an oath of confidentiality. Against what Feeney (1974) and Cooney (1999b) wrote, and some others claimed, MacMahon says the secretaries were happy, as a team, working with McQuaid, but re-iterates he would not have spoken to them about policy matters. Indeed, MacMahon believes McQuaid alone knew the entire picture on any matter and his advisers and other sources of information knew only specific angles. He sums him up as a "good listener" and "extraordinarily good" on a one-to-one basis, "...a remarkable personality and I certainly felt very privileged to be there working with the other secretaries for him...". Some priests used the secretaries as barometers, Gallagher recalling one who "would phone McQuaid in the morning and before speaking to him, he would ask the secretary, 'what's the humour like this morning?' and if the humour wasn't good, he wouldn't speak to him".

Fr. Chris Mangan, secretary from 1941 to 1957, gave his memories, to be published only after his death. He found McQuaid an "exceptional man", the "kindest man I ever met or lived or worked with...". He saw him as a "warm and even emotional man, kind and compassionate with a wide range of interests and friendships". Mangan told McQuaid, on appointment, that he wasn't going to say he agreed with what he said, if he didn't agree. Nor was he going to say things just to please him. "He agreed with me...He would bristle sometimes when I acted that way, even then I would find him

doing the things that I said". Mangan gives a rare example of McQuaid's emotions:

"...his sister died not long after she retired. He didn't show a lot of emotion then but a month afterwards I was going home with him to Killiney from Drumcondra and he said: 'Today a month ago I lost Helen [Murtagh]'. And the tears ran down his cheeks. That was the first and only experience I had of his emotions" (Kirby 1990:316-320).

Another example of McQuaid's emotion is given by Lehane who remembers him on one occasion, just arrived at Rockwell, sitting on the side of his bed, dangling his feet, looking at the coal fire, and saying: "This is heaven". Then, there was his letter to Burke Savage (14/12/63) declining an invitation to lunch: "As I shall spend Saturday morning with the dentist, I should like to be excused from the lunch, for I cannot eat normally nor speak properly at the moment" (Ar-79).

Gaughan believes the secretaries "had a tough time as well, because he didn't treat them like friends. Normally a bishop would have his secretary and they would be pals. But they had a very, very official relationship". He adds that they were tremendously loyal to him.

Clonliffe College students

The interviews indicate McQuaid's changing strategy towards the Clonliffe students, from the 1940s and 1950s, when he never spoke to them, to the

1960s when he had one-to-one meetings at least once a year and often acted as a spiritual counsellor and friend.

Stack says: "We never saw him during seven years, our archbishop, except once, he came in and he gave us a very chilly sort of admonitory talk on the Mass or something ...". Father B: "...he was an austere figure and he would come over occasionally to preside at lectures or something like that". Father C: "...we didn't know him well. He never interviewed us, we never met him ...He was a remote, austere figure to everybody...".

Battelle believes the change was because McQuaid

"was beginning to realise that he was too distant from them...He would get them to go over and he would talk to them about the facts of life...And then he began to have individual friends...A couple of them are still around. Diarmuid Martin [now Archbishop of Dublin] was one of them ...".

Martin was one of the first members of the Congress Volunteer Corps in 1961. He assured Vincent Browne, shortly after his appointment as Co-adjutor Archbishop, that he was not a "favourite" (RTE Radio 2003c).

Father A remembers those meetings in Clonliffe and how McQuaid "would just talk away about what we were doing and so on." These meetings were "a breakthrough" for Father A and fellow-students. At first they didn't know what to expect, "but I found him very personable and interested, a

gentle kind of person. And he gave me books". One of these books was *Introduction to the Devout Life*, a classic by St. Francis de Sales who was known for the gentleness of his style as a counsellor and as a bishop in the early 17th century. But, for Father A, even in these meetings, McQuaid "was always very formal, but at the same time very personable".

Dermod McCarthy believes McQuaid saved his vocation to the priesthood at one of these meetings. "...I poured out all my fears about the place and about my life and whether I was right for the priesthood". McCarthy was about to say he was leaving the College, when McQuaid

"...said to me: 'Dermod, do you see that large red book on the third shelf from the bottom', and the bookcase was across the room. I went over. It was the Bible. He said: 'Bring it over here'. He stood up from the desk and went to the fireplace. Sat down in an armchair on one side of the fire...He ushered me to sit down on the other side. He said: 'Open it at the *Book of Ecclesiastes*'. Of course, I had to skim very quickly through the Bible to see if I could find it quickly by chance!...And I found the *Book of Ecclesiastes*. 'Now', he said, 'go to the eleventh chapter, and the fourth verse'. And this was the way he led up to it, the build up...and he said, 'Read it out for me'. It was: 'Keep watching the wind and you will never sow; stare only at clouds and you will never reap". 'So, Dermod, make not haste in times of clouds'. And that was an extraordinary moment because I have never forgotten it...On a personal level I had to be grateful to him for that".

Pat Buckley came to Clonliffe in 1970, and he remembers his visits to Killiney which continued after McQuaid's retirement:

"I liked him and he seemed to like me. I went to see him a week or two before his resignation was to take effect. He told me that he was sorry to be going. He further said: 'Will you come and visit me in my retirement? Now that I have power I have many friends. But as soon as I lose my power I will lose many friends too'. I assured him that I would not forget him and that I would visit him at his home in Killiney...I found him old-fashioned and strict. But I wanted to use him as a confessor as much for his sake as for mine. I wanted him to feel that he was needed and trusted. He always had afternoon tea with me and he never failed to give me my bus fare [back to Clonliffe]"(1994:25).

These meetings with students were not favoured by staff who felt McQuaid "was maybe threading on their ground a bit..."(Father A); "...they were a bit concerned about what the students might be saying about them"(Murray); "...the staff decided whether somebody should remain on in the College...And a few people had appealed to McQuaid over their heads. And he had reversed the decision"(Gaughan).

McQuaid thought highly of staff and students at Clonliffe. Finbar Ryan wrote (22/10/67) after McQuaid visited him in hospital in Cork: "What you said of Clonliffe gave me especial joy, you have made a bastion of sacerdotal dignity and orthodoxy – and this is of inestimable importance not only for Dublin but for Ireland"(Ar-16). Mgr. Luciano Storero, at the Nunciature, sent McQuaid the routine five-yearly form and questionnaire about the state of seminaries in his diocese (23/5/62), asking also for a report "containing further particulars on the principal problems of seminary life, i.e. discipline,

piety, studies etc". McQuaid wrote "no problems" on his reply to Nuncio Sensi (1/10/62) (Ar-21).

Clonliffe College and Mater Dei staff

When McQuaid wanted to build a new wing to Clonliffe College in the late 1950s, Father B remembers Fr. Brian Connolly, the bursar, saying at a staff meeting with McQuaid that it would be "his headache", to which McQuaid replied: "Father, it is not your headache, it is my headache". Eventually he got up "in anger" at the staff resistance. Following morning he sent a note to the President saying the building was to go ahead as originally planned. "That was the kind of consultation", says Father B.

Murray gives a similar example of 'consultation' with the Mater Dei staff when McQuaid spoke about some matter and asked if they had comments. One priest, the late Paddy Wallace, stood up: "Your Grace, I was thinking...", and McQuaid interrupted: "I know, Father, exactly what you are thinking ...".

Father B says McQuaid's dealings were with the President, rarely with other members of staff. In favour of McQuaid, Father B says even after the Council he never interfered with what they were teaching. Murray likewise says while McQuaid might have asked occasionally at Mater Dei how they dealt with a particular topic, he trusted the staff and the "orthodoxy of their teaching". It seems, from Murray, that the relationships were better with staff at Mater Dei than Clonliffe. Curtin says Clonliffe and Mater Dei had

the same President and mostly the same staff, but as Director of Studies at Clonliffe, he found "a certain diversion of interest" with some preferring to teach the younger people at Mater Dei instead of the theology students who would be more critical in those years after the Council". Curtin adds that the Clonliffe staff remained united and did not have the same tensions and disputes that were experienced at Maynooth.

Murray believes staff in Clonliffe "would be afraid" of McQuaid, "probably more so than students", and he would have "little trials of strength" on small points, such as with the President, Canon Cathal McCarthy, over the correct height for the candles behind the cross on the altar. Father C also says "the men in Clonliffe were afraid of him", giving two examples of the uneasy relationship. One, the staff "didn't accept any invitations to speak anywhere because it was regarded as dangerous...I remember one of them saying to me, when I wrote an article for *The Furrow*, 'You are very lucky, you know, being able to do that because none of us would dare...'. The other example was sending Christmas cards to staff and how they examined them to see if they were in favour because if he said 'My dear Patrick', you were in, if he said, 'My dear Father Murphy', well, you were OK, if he said, 'Dear Father Murphy', you felt uneasy, you felt there might something wrong. Fehily also refers to the distinction between McQuaid writing "My dear" and "Dear" and how it could shift, even temporarily, depending on how pleased he was with you. This can be seen in the Burke Savage letters (Ar-79). Fehily quotes him as saying he never used the Christian name to a priest.

University College, Dublin

University College, Dublin (UCD), originally formed as the Catholic University of Ireland in 1854, became a constituent college of the National University of Ireland in 1908. Up to the early 1960s the Faculty of Philosophy & Sociology was staffed mainly by Dublin diocesan priests and there were priests also in other departments and in the chaplaincy service. There was a perception that McQuaid had a strong influence throughout UCD, particularly through Monsignor John Denis Horgan, Professor of Metaphysics and Dean of the Faculty. Garvin (2004:59) believes Horgan, as McQuaid's agent in UCD, kept "a watchful eye on the religious lives and intellectual opinions of the professors, lecturers and students, particularly in the moral sciences: philosophy, politics, ethics, sociology, psychology, logic and education". McCartney believes the fact that Horgan was used, at least on some occasions, as official intermediary between the Archbishop and the President, conferred on him an influence beyond his own Department and Faculty that he knew how to exploit (1999:217). Horgan was a member of the Senate of NUI (1952-72), elected by the Graduates Panel. Ward says "the general image" was that Horgan was "representing" McQuaid: "He was understood to be very influential. I would say his influence was probably waning by the stage I was there".

Connell says Horgan was perceived to be in the confidence of McQuaid when he joined the staff in 1953, but his influence was resented by two younger professors, Fr. Feichín O'Doherty and Fr. Conor Martin. Connell remembers a form of "revolt" in 1955 when he was invited to a meeting,

even though he was Horgan's assistant. For some time after this McQuaid distanced himself from Horgan and "made it quite clear that if he had a representative in UCD it was Mgr. Boylan". Connell wasn't happy and returned his loyalty to Horgan. He says Horgan was 'back in favour' by 1961 when he was given an important liturgical role in the Patrician Year celebrations. Connell (2) agrees the revolt failed, in the long run, because Horgan was a cleverer politician than O'Doherty and Martin. He says Horgan had a lot of influence with McQuaid who valued him for his contacts with Michael Tierney, the University President. Connell says Horgan had been one of the architects of Tierney's surprise election to the post in 1947. Connell also points to McQuaid's failed lobbying, through his contacts in UCD, to obtain the Professorship of Medieval History in 1962 for Maurice Sheehy, a Dublin priest who was later laicised. Sheehy eventually obtained the Professorship of Palaeography.

Garvin, now Professor of Politics, was a student and then a lecturer from the late 1960s. He says McQuaid did not give instructions to the priests in UCD, that "such instructions were unnecessary, so powerful the fear of the 'A-B'" (1998:309). He believes McQuaid had erected a "pyramid of political and cultural power" and again emphasises the palpable fear of McQuaid, "truly incomprehensible to lay people in academia, which pervaded some groups of priest-academics in UCD" (1998:313).

Garvin holds (1998:312) that John H. Whyte, the first lay lecturer in Ethics & Politics, was forced into resigning his post in the mid-1960s because

McQuaid did not want him "poking into the affairs of the diocese", in the course of preparing his book, *Church and State in Modern Ireland 1923-70* (1971, 1980). A search of the Whyte papers at UCD, Belfield, did not reveal any reference to the resignation but Whyte's extensive notes were found from an interview of more than three hours, with dinner, which McQuaid granted him at Killiney in 1969, shortly before he completed his book. Whyte found McQuaid completely at ease, and not at all on the defensive: "I had difficulty afterwards in reconciling this courteous and kindly gentleman with the waspish letters and verbal rebukes which I know him to have produced". He did, however, find McQuaid "rather pre-occupied with 'his enemies' (Ar-82). Ward, lecturer and later Professor of Sociology, says he "certainly never had any contact let alone pressure or anything" from McQuaid, adding:

"In the somewhat chaotic days of the late 1960s, coming into the 1970s, I used to cheerfully say that I would regard myself and the other priests in the university as the most independent people of the lot because as far as the Archbishop was concerned we were university staff members...he definitely did not interfere".

Masterson, one of the first lay lecturers in Philosophy, and President of UCD (1986-1993), says, "...there was always talk about the role that the Archbishop played in the university. I never came across it...I suppose it would be at one remove...if the Archbishop had some influence in the university...Mgr. Horgan was thought to be his particular friend". Masterson says that in the university in the 1960s there were many

developments, including appointments, in supposedly “sensitive areas such as philosophy”, which were clearly not screened by McQuaid”. He gives examples of lecturers of “advanced thinking”, such as the Dominican, Fr. Fergal O’Connor and several lay people, such as Denys Turner, John Maguire, John Whyte and Philip Pettit who came in at that time and would hardly have shared McQuaid’s views.

Archives confirm McQuaid’s influence through Mgr Horgan and suggest it was unbroken even during the ‘revolt’ in the late 1950s. The close relationship with Tierney, President to 1964, is also confirmed. McQuaid remained in regular touch with Jeremiah Hogan who followed Tierney. McQuaid often said he held no post in any of the UCD structures, but it is clear, also from McCartney (1999), that he had influence (Ar-7). McCartney also shows that the Archbishop of Dublin still retained the title of Rector of the Catholic University which remained “more as a legal fiction” (1999:145). McQuaid thanked Tierney, in 1959, for his “kindness in facilitating me in the Catechetics Course for Primary Teachers about which we spoke when last you called. Monsignor Horgan undertook to explain to you my very grave anxiety in view of the Trinity developments”. McQuaid (4/4/60) congratulated Tierney on the outcome of the Dáil debate on University College, “and I thank you for the enormous work that you have put into securing for Catholics their fundamental rights”. On some unspecified matters, Tierney tells McQuaid (25/4/60): “As regards Your Grace’s other two suggestions, Mgr Horgan has already spoken to me about them”(Ar-63). McQuaid took an active interest in a proposal in 1960 to start a

journalism diploma at UCD and was disappointed when it failed due to opposition from both academic and journalistic quarters. The idea seems to have originated with the Knights of St. Columbanus and some journalists who were Knights. Horgan is shown as McQuaid's link with Tierney on the matter (Ar-60).

On Tierney's retirement, McQuaid wrote (27/9/64): "I thank you, too, for having continuously assisted me as Archbishop in all the measures that I proposed to you for the good of the Catholic students"(Ar-63). McCartney says Tierney "concurred emphatically" with the Bishops and especially with McQuaid on the Trinity College question (1999:184). Myles, son of Michael Tierney, says his father had a close relationship with McQuaid but did not agree with McQuaid's "outbursts" against Trinity (conversation, 16/2/04).

McQuaid controlled the appointment of his own priests to the University staff, but once they had statutory positions, which might not happen for twenty years, it would have been difficult to remove them. One said, however, that they would have been unlikely to disobey if at any time he had assigned them elsewhere. It would seem, from Masterson, that McQuaid did not have any vetting over who was appointed. But, there was one instance, when praising the Irish Columban Fathers and their missionary efforts in a letter to Nuncio Riberi, McQuaid said (14/2/61): "I had their Director, Father Bastable, a Doctor of Philosophy, an unusually intelligent priest, appointed a Lecturer at the University in the Faculty of Philosophy"(Ar-20).

ARCHBISHOP AND LAITY

Control of ideas and publications

In response to Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, in Rome, McQuaid replied to Nuncio Sensi (15/3/67) that "already in this Diocese, the system of censorship is amply organised with many censors acting under the Chief Censor"(Ar-21).

Gill gives examples of how McQuaid applied the canon law requirement for an ecclesiastical censor to read and approve all books of a religious nature before they could be given an *imprimatur* (permission to be printed) in his diocese. Gill says the censor appointed by McQuaid was usually a conservative priest, and McQuaid "imposed very rigorous control over what came out in the diocese...he intervened on many occasions with the books that were on display in Gill's bookshop. He would have disagreed theologically".

Hurley refers to censorship on the Milltown Park lectures whereby not the speakers, nor their topics, but the press releases, had to be submitted for prior approval. This led to one lecture, by himself, on original sin, being cancelled without notice (1998:244). When Greene served as a censor there were some "problem writers" and McQuaid was "at his wits' end". Butler thinks McQuaid went through "a lot of heartaches" with theological speculation appearing in print.

When McQuaid told Burke Savage (23/3/67) that it was not his idea but he “would not object” to an article on censorship in *Studies*, he said “very much would depend on the writer – whether he gives us the increased liberalism of recent years that has made a *ludibrium* of anyone who stands for censorship”(Ar-79)

The Jesuit, Teilhard de Chardin, became a cult figure in those years because of his views on evolution. Church authorities were suspicious because of implications of his teaching for the traditional biblical notion of a single first man and woman, Adam and Eve, and how it would impact the theology of original sin. Nuncio Riberi told McQuaid (28/1/60) about Vatican concern that new editions of de Chardin were being published in various languages. McQuaid replied (30/1/60): “Some years ago I had noted the tenour of these works and taken action. I will see to it that the instruction will continue to be observed in my Seminary, and will secure, as far as I can, the exclusion of the works from Catholic bookshops” (Ar-20). McQuaid told Nuncio Sensi (28/6/65) that “Irish Youth organisations are almost entirely under Catholic control. Communist literature addressed to them is confiscated on arrival”(Ar-21).

McQuaid’s approach to liturgical art and design was strict and often controversial. With regard to a statue of Christ the King, by Andrew O’Connor, he told Nuncio Levame (1955): “I have succeeded in having [it] quietly set aside”, adding that “no statue or picture is erected in any Church

or public oratory, no plan of a Church is accepted, without my personal censorship"(Ar-19).

McQuaid told the International Congress of the Cinema in 1955 that in Ireland, "happily we have a system of State censorship that, in general, satisfies the demands of the common good...We have scant regard to the system that calls itself liberal, though, in fact, it is the intolerance that will allow every liberty except that of choosing objective truth"(1956:226). In 1965, he told the annual meeting of the National Film Institute that Irish people "accept and want" censorship because they accept "the natural and moral Christian law"(*The Irish Times*, 18/2/65).

McQuaid's secretiveness created the impression that his influence was all-pervading. Masterson says: "He did seem to instil a great deal of apprehension in people and they were conscious of him and his presumed influence throughout all sorts of spheres, though I wonder whether the basis of this was more in the claims of some individuals to represent his view rather than initiatives of the Archbishop himself". Stack refers to the secret Vigilance ("V") committee of priests which investigated lay people and kept files on them, not just suspected communist sympathisers but right wingers also, such as members of the Maria Duce movement. Stack says the V committee was typical of an extraordinary control culture that McQuaid exercised through his priests. Bowman, from the archives, (RTE Television 1998b) found that the

V Committee saw communism and liberalism as a threat to the Church. At an early meeting which the Archbishop attended, he told them he was anxious for any information they could give him. To be specific he had 104 names and he wanted to know what parish they lived in and what precisely they were up to.

The efficiency of the V committee was probably exaggerated but it is still a sensitive subject and its papers, although included in the preview for journalists in 1998, have not been released yet for research.

The organisers of the 1958 Tostal Theatre Festival in Dublin withdrew a play based on James Joyce's *Ulysses* as well as a new one by Sean O'Casey, *The Drums of Fr. Ned*, and, as a result, the entire Festival for that year was scrapped, because McQuaid had expressed his disapproval, which was supported by the Lord Mayor, the Jesuits, trade unions and others (Cooney 1999b:329-30; Whelan 2002: 114-5).

For many years the Knights of St. Columbanus helped McQuaid in his censorship efforts (Ar-80). Conservative Catholics had a great fear of 'dirty' books in the 50s and early 60s and a contempt for their authors, and the Knights acted as policemen for McQuaid. They watched the theatre closely and there were numerous well-publicised incidents. The archives contain a letter from Dermot O'Flynn, Supreme Knight, to McQuaid re Brendan Behan's, *The Hostage* (4/11/60): "I regret to report that, despite advance protests, *The Hostage* will start Monday next at the Olympia. Assurances have been given that objectionable sequences have been removed – but, the

whole play is so degenerate, I doubt if editing could satisfy". McQuaid's note (6/11/60): "...Keep your grip on the situation. Could you get me a copy of the play?"(Ar-80).

Control of newspapers

In the 1940s and 1950s, the *Irish Press* and *Irish Independent* submitted advertisements of a religious nature, including small ones, for McQuaid's clearance before accepting them for publication and articles on theological matters were often offered also. The archives do not show such a practice in the 1960s. McQuaid may have requested this approval or it may have been done voluntarily by the papers or inherited from the previous archbishop. McQuaid refused small ads if there was any link between the Mass and money, such as missionary priests asking for stipends for Masses said abroad (Ar-55).

In 1957, M.MacDonagh, Editor of *The Standard* (a Catholic weekly) submitted directly to a censor, Fr. O'Reilly, an article by Fr. John Fennelly, dealing with liturgical matters. O'Reilly's note to McQuaid's secretary, Michael O'Connell (26/2/57): "...on page 3, Father Fennelly states that the views expressed are strictly personal. On the same page he speaks of reforming public worship, breaking the liturgical ice and goes on to say that 'the result might well be a revival of declining faith". McQuaid's note: "Please refer to Father McCarthy and note that censorship is meant to be a secret process. It is not open to the Editor to know who is Censor"(Ar-56). The censor's name was required on books, booklets and magazines, but that

was public censorship as distinct from private and hidden censorship applied to newspapers like *The Standard*.

Involving the laity

McQuaid did not believe the Church should be solely 'clerical'. He told the Public Image Committee (24/1/64) that "the image of the Church as made up of Bishops, priests and nuns is a grave misconception. The Bishop is unfortunately regarded as 'the Church'". He added: "We all are the Church. We differ in function. Unfortunately in this country – for historical reasons - the Bishop is regarded as the Church. This concept will take years to eliminate" (Ar-61). He seems not to have had any problem with the involvement of lay people in teaching religion, expressing, in 1962, his confidence in their knowledge of the Faith and their "zeal in passing it on to the children, because I am intimately conscious of the fact that if the Church flourishes in this country it is due to the lay teachers..."(Ar-10). Likewise, contrary to some perceptions, he trusted lay people in the running of secondary schools, telling Bishop Hanly of Elphin (5/1/63): "It is indifferent to me that our secondary schools should be operated by layfolk, as are our primary schools. If we cannot as Bishops trust our layfolk to operate our schools, we have gravely failed in the education of our layfolk"(Ar-10).

McQuaid was grateful to the Knights for driving lecturers to and from the outreach lectures, but when it came to anything he might see as overlapping with the clerical role, he held back. He did not seem to believe that Knights could give lectures, telling their AGM (26/6/59) that "very few of us can be

specialists who are competent to lecture on these courses, but each brother who has personally supplied transport, is responsible before God for having spread the light of Catholic teaching (Ar-80).

Lovatt-Dolan says McQuaid had "a very strong sense of the vocation of lay people to be active in the world as well as in the Church" and when he was dealing with women "he would expect them to be able to account for themselves and not be sitting at home knitting cushion covers or something".

Knights of St. Columbanus

The Knights were criticised as secretive because they did not allow members to reveal their own membership nor identify others. However, they gave generous assistance to McQuaid's projects, such as raising money for charitable and other causes. Gallagher, Supreme Knight after the McQuaid years, says the Archbishop would speak at their meetings; they would come to his assistance if he so required. Greene says McQuaid "favoured the involvement of lay people in the Church" and adds:

"...the very fact that he established so many and blessed so many lay organisations, in particular the Knights of St. Columbanus, of which I was, up to recently, Supreme Chaplain, would have suggested to me that John Charles saw committed layfolk and well-educated lay-folk as a very integral instrument in the spread of the Faith...".

Addressing their AGM, McQuaid (26/6/64) said:

I thank you for all your devotedness in the cause of the Faith. For the rest of the country I cannot speak: For Dublin I can, and I am the witness of this vast, silent, crusade of generous service that is your distinctive contribution. Each day at Mass I remember you, because you are my fellow-helpers in so many aspects of the apostolate" (Ar-80).

In 1967, the Knights had 1600 members in the Dublin area, about one quarter of their total membership. They assisted in many areas of charitable work (Ar-24).

Vincent Grogan, a Dublin barrister, was elected Supreme Knight in 1966. He sought to remove the secrecy surrounding the Knights and open them up to the advances of Vatican II. Grogan appeared regularly on television and was clearly what McQuaid would see as a 'liberal'. There was a public perception of Grogan as the 'Pope John' of the Knights, opening the windows of renewal and proclaiming the *aggiornamento*. At the annual banquet, following his election, Grogan had marked out his path, saying the Christian message was "a living message to a living, changing world" and that the bishops were not "curators of a museum, and we are not caretakers engaged merely in dusting the exhibits". It was as witnesses of Christ that "we interpret the Church itself to the world". He said the Church's task of self-renewal brought with it so many changes that "...some have fear of

change. Yet, it has been well said that to be afraid of change in the Church is, in a sense, to be afraid of meeting Christ in our worldly life (Ar-80).

Grogan continued his programme of reform and renewal. His final message, in 1969, thanked those who had encouraged him by their co-operation, and added thanks also to “you who, with sincerity and candour, have opposed some of my ideas or criticised my shortcomings”(Ar-80).

An undated RTE radio clip of Grogan shows how he found his relationship with McQuaid “never easy, and, indeed, never happy”. He found him “intractable” in private and “certainly not malleable in his point of view”. Grogan believed McQuaid wanted those who were in some position to exercise or influence public opinion, like himself, “to do so in entire deference and obedience to a very literal point of view which he took about Catholic doctrine”(RTE Radio 2003b).

Legion of Mary

McQuaid supported Frank Duff and the Legion of Mary during Vatican II. There were signs in 1960 that he had concerns, or had other people expressing them to him, about the Legion. He asked Kavanagh for comments and these were severe: “The literary style of the Handbook is poor”; “I believe the Recruiting and Training for legionaries is haphazard”; “The Handbook considers that every Catholic is capable of being a Legionary...that from the first the candidate can participate fully in the works of the Legion”. Kavanagh believed the expansion of praesidia

[branches] had often been "haphazard"; There seemed to be a "certain independence of episcopal control"(Ar-81).

In the same file there is an anonymous response to Kavanagh, the writer saying there were "no positive recommendations" and rebuffing Kavanagh on his "opinion" that the literary style of the Handbook was poor. The writer said the knowledge required of the legionary depended on the work he was asked to do and that the system of training was the master and apprentice system "followed universally in the trades and professions", that shortcomings in application of the Legion system "will be found to be due either to the lack of a spiritual director or of one insufficiently interested". If there were too many praesidia, that was the "fault of the ecclesiastical authorities" because the permission of the parish priest or the bishop was required before one could be established. The writer quoted the Handbook to show that the Constitution of the Legion reserved to the Bishop and to the *Concilium Legionis* [Governing Body] the right to dissolve an existing Praesidium or Higher Council. There is neither evidence of any further action nor why McQuaid asked Kavanagh for his comments (Ar-81).

McQuaid asked the Pope in 1961 to award the Knighthood of St. Gregory to Duff, but was then embarrassed when Duff was reluctant to accept it (23/4/61): "I would eagerly accept it if I could think that it would mean a new era. But I do not think it would". McQuaid was puzzled and embarrassed, telling Duff (25/4/61) he would notify the Holy See of Duff's refusal: "The motives of your refusal I regard as a personal matter to which I

am not entitled to refer in my notification". Duff later changed his mind and told McQuaid (17/10/61), he was now willing to accept the Papal honour. (Ar-81).

There was further indication that the Legion was in difficulty when McQuaid (5/3/62) asked Canon Cathal McCarthy, President, Clonliffe College, for his opinion on the position of its spiritual directors. In 1962 there were 646 praesidia in Dublin about 200 of which had no spiritual director. McCarthy (6/3/62) suggested holding a conference for directors:

"The important thing is that Your Grace would issue the invitations and say a few sentences at the beginning: this is the kernel of the whole plan. It would – or should – kill forever the allegation that the Legion is under a cloud of disapproval from the 'diocesan authorities'. I honestly do not see how this charge can be conscientiously made, at least if 'diocesan authorities' means Your Grace"(Ar-81).

The tone of McQuaid's correspondence with individual Legionaries is gentle and personal. Directors of Legion hostels were frequently thanking him for gifts he had sent, not just cheques but for special needs like the "very welcome gift of eggs"(Ar-81).

The Russian Orthodox Church invited Duff to Moscow to consider the establishment of the Legion there. The Vatican feared it might be a

communist manoeuvre and, in response to Nuncio Sensi, McQuaid replied (11/10/63):

I should have no fear on Mr. Duff's account. He is entirely loyal, sharp-witted and, what is not always realised, very unusually intelligent. He is one of the most intelligent men I have ever met. One could miss that quality. He would not suffer from such a visit nor would he damage the cause of the Faith.

Finally, Sensi (27/4/64) told McQuaid the Vatican had decided against approving the visit, "*non expedire*" (Ar-21).

McQuaid retained his admiration for Duff. When Gallagher (1/7/71) sent McQuaid the drawings for a Legion of Mary Commemorative plaque in Myra Street, with the inscription written by Duff, McQuaid replied (19/7/71): "I dislike the wording but if Mr. Duff has chosen it, I shall not object. Plaque will look well. What is price?" (Ar-81). The Gallagher interview backs this up.

The Golden Jubilee of the Legion, September 1971, saw 5,000 people gathered for an open-air concelebrated Mass. Nuncio Alibrandi was principal concelebrant and shook Frank Duff's hand, saying: "Congratulations". McQuaid preached the sermon and outlined the Legion's work and achievements, describing the occasion as a "rightful cause of joy". The Irish Bishops published a letter to Duff confirming that the days of clouds and suspicion had passed: "We praise you for your

steadfastness with which you have conserved the basic constitution sanctioned by thousands of bishops and approved by the authority of the Holy See”(J.Power 1971).

The poor and less-privileged

McQuaid’s kindness for the poor and less-privileged laity of his diocese matched his kindness to priests. Battelle was a curate in the Pro-Cathedral in the late 1960s: “...the amount of people that used to write to him for financial help, and he would just check it out with us and the amount of money he would have sent to them, it was quite extraordinary”. Fehily was amazed “to find the depth of his kindness and real love for people, especially people in need. He was always worried about the poor “. Scott remembers how, coming out from a visit to the Boys’ Club, “he would slip whoever was nearest the door a cheque for a hundred pounds”. Gallagher confirms this memory.

Greene instances McQuaid’s consecration as Archbishop in 1940, during the war, when he did not want the traditional reception, “he wished the money would go to the poor of Dublin...I suppose if there was anything that would epitomise John Charles for me it was summarised in one word, compassion”.

This generosity, from special diocesan funds at his disposal, showed up his innocence. Gaughan says he was taken in by “conmen” all right, and that people used to get in to see him and it “bothered him, because, frankly, he

was naïve". He says McQuaid had never had the experience that priests in parishes had of meeting all sorts of people face-to-face. He had an innocence and too easily believed hard-luck stories". Father B also gives examples of this innocence.

McQuaid had particular regard for the travelling community, then described as 'itinerants'. He actively supported moves to get housing for them despite local residents' opposition. He was patron to the Dublin Itinerant Settlement Committee and appointed Fehily as their chaplain. He was also anxious for the spiritual and material welfare of emigrants to Britain and sent priests to minister where they most commonly lived and worked. Griffin, one of those priests, recalls it as "a great movement, a really great movement", and Eamonn Casey, a leader in that work, on appointment as Bishop of Kerry in 1969, thanked McQuaid for "the inspiration, the encouragement and the unfailing support" he had given to the emigrant chaplaincy (Ar-7).

Young people

Members of the Colleges' Volunteer Corps went with the annual diocesan pilgrimage to Lourdes to help with the sick people. One of the chaplains remembers how "they were constantly up and down to McQuaid and had complete access". Greene says McQuaid "cultivated their friendship, and they had, you might say, the right of access to him, and, for some of them, he became their father confessor...". Fehily thanked McQuaid (5/7/61) for

meeting the boys: "Your Grace had a tremendous effect on them and those I have met since then can talk of nothing else"(Ar-24).

When McQuaid noticed that a Dublin hostel for homeless boys was overcrowded and lacked resources, he asked Fehily to purchase a more suitable premises and run it. Fehily says McQuaid visited those boys once a week and he "would arrive with cakes, big trays of cakes". And he remembers seeing McQuaid out to the car one evening, "...and a window opened upstairs and a young fellow put his head out, 'hey, hey, you' and the Archbishop looked up, 'yes, you Father, I want you', and he went in and up to him...". Scott recalls that when McQuaid visited the Blackrock College Boys' Club he always liked to be left alone for a period with the boys, and "...he obviously at that stage came out of his shyness because he seemed to be able to converse freely with them".

Father C says McQuaid tended to be suspicious of university students and lost opportunities to win their support, adding that in the 1960s, they would have "eaten out of his hand" if he had unbent a little, but his position was that "students had no business writing their opinion in newspapers...especially about the Church". Conway, then Auxiliary Bishop of Armagh, asked McQuaid's permission when invited to UCD. McQuaid replied (2/11/58): "I am willing that Your Lordship should again speak in public in Dublin at the Literary & Historical Society of UCD. I only hope that the meeting will be so conducted that the dignity of the Episcopal status will not be embarrassed"(Ar-6).

Lay staff

Ann Lee was the first female staff member at Archbishop's House, as secretary to Mgr. Gerard Sheehy in the Chancellery from the mid-1960s. Lee continued as Sheehy's secretary to his death in 2003. She had the highest regard for McQuaid: "He was very kind and very thorough. He was very considerate to all the staff...I found him very warm and a nice person to work with. I didn't see any sort of sides to him, at all...". Lee says there was something very special about him and how he appreciated everything she did for him, "I didn't feel fear, I had respect for him". She recalls his great interest in her hockey and tennis at the Railway Union club and how he would read the Monday papers and then discuss the weekend results with her.

As for Osmond Dowling, in the Press Office, his letters to McQuaid, handwritten, as was the etiquette laid down by McQuaid, always started "My Lord Archbishop" and concluded "Your Grace's obedient servant". On one occasion, in the cold of January, Dowling apologised for typing (9/1/67): "My hands are cold and if I were to write it you would not be able to read it"(Ar-42). Dowling had direct access to McQuaid, although MacMahon could be described as his 'line manager'. Dowling was quite informal in expressing his views, without fear or excessive awe, the sort of positive approach seen also in McQuaid's correspondence with Dunn and Burke Savage (Ar-34). But, there were tensions in the relationship with Dowling not always given sufficient information, as he noted to MacMahon on several occasions, such as before the Mansion House meeting (14/1/66):

If I am invited to the function in the Mansion House on Tuesday next, I will be happy to accept, without necessarily becoming involved in or interfering with the press relations on that occasion. If, however, I am personally or through you instructed by His Grace, or requested by Father Burke Savage to assist in dealing with the press on Tuesday night, I will certainly do so provided that I am given in advance all the information that I require...(Ar-40).

McQuaid was annoyed when Dowling pressed him for a photocall at Archbishop's House in Drumcondra for the visit of Archbishops Ramsey and Simms in 1967. McQuaid had earlier declined but Dowling persisted. McQuaid replied (20/6/67): "Photographers will not be welcome at my house, but I shall tolerate their presence for Fr. Arrupe [a separate visit by the Jesuit General] and Archbishop Ramsey...You will not take my reconsideration as evidence that, because I am pressed, I shall yield in other cases (Ar-42).

T.P.O'Mahony (*Evening Press*, 6/4/68) reported the introduction of a two-tier minimum income scheme for Dublin parish priests and curates. He had approached Dowling who was unaware of it, as he had not been informed. Dowling inquired and was told it was only being considered, then that it was purely an administrative matter and of no concern to the press (Ar-66).

Dowling once offered to resign because he released information before an embargo McQuaid had set without informing him (Ar-66). Dowling again complained to McQuaid when Fr. Paul Freeney published an article in

Doctrine & Life on the Post-Ordination Pastoral Course, saying he was not told in advance and was embarrassed when the media asked him about it. McQuaid (9/10/69) noted Dowling's "formal protest"

but I should have thought that you would have sent me a letter of sympathy because one of my priests, without the slightest reference to me, printed such a report on a confidential meeting. Confidence may be abused, but we must still believe in Confidence and live on that basis (Ar-47).

Freeney (1969:568-71) reported on the meeting of 200 priests, an intriguing few days "but mainly because that priests present were indeed critical, and few diocesan sacred cows escaped unscathed, yet not a harsh word was spoken, there was no call for revolution, and any criticisms made were both serious and charitable"(568). Freeney added that "above all there was no rancour, no harsh criticism, no angry young men. Bishop Carroll expressed pride at the tone of the meeting"(571).

Journalists

McQuaid seemed not to understand the media and he distrusted journalists, but most of them were Catholics and he was solicitous for them as 'his people'. His relationships with individual journalists changed from the 1940s when he dismissed a request for a meeting with Bill Sweetman, Editor, *Irish Press*, saying he was a "mere" editor and would only speak to his employers (Ar-54). However, he did more than speak to Sweetman's contemporary, R.M.Smyllie, a Protestant, Editor of *The Irish Times* (1934-54),

he had him out frequently to dinner in Killiney to meet people of interest to him as a journalist. This connection started when Smyllie's paper had accused McQuaid of closing down a centre in Rathmines run by Catholics and Protestants together. This, McQuaid reckoned, was the sixteenth such incident where he was accused "unjustly" of blocking charities involving Protestants. He asked why should he interfere – he had grown up amongst Protestants (Ar-82).

In the late 1960s, McQuaid formed a special friendship with *Irish Press* editor, Tim Pat Coogan, and his wife, Geraldine (Cherry), although there had been, two years earlier, the instance of unanswered queries to him when he was writing his book, *Ireland Since the Rising*. At that time McQuaid noted: "Only yesterday the Bishops warned me that this man [Coogan] is going to write a flaming book of criticism" and: "I shall not meet Mr. Coogan nor Mr. [Tony] Gray [who was writing a separate book]. The questions are impertinent intrusions into my personal life, or tendentious misrepresentations in several cases. He knows perfectly well the answers" (Ar-32).

The McQuaid/Coogan correspondence, between 1967 and 1971 (Ar-54), is the best example of a close relationship between McQuaid and a journalist. It started with Cherry writing to McQuaid (3/1/67) for help to find a university place for a disadvantaged young man, one of several young people such as unmarried mothers, boys out of orphanages and others with disadvantages, whom the Coogans took into their home at that time.

McQuaid did so and Coogan got the young man a job in the *Irish Press*. The subsequent correspondence was mainly with Coogan who wrote very informally, while McQuaid showed appreciation for their good work. Coogan says McQuaid frequently helped these young people with jobs and support, such as paying for them to go to college (conversation, 15/2/06).

McQuaid thanked Coogan (12/2/68) for his support in an *Irish Press* editorial, "The Dual Role of Mr. Faulkner", when Northern Ireland Stormont Minister, Brian Faulkner, had criticised McQuaid for saying the Catholic Church is "the only one true Church of Christ" and had called on him "to accept realities". The editorial stated that Dr. McQuaid was "a churchman, not a politician, and is pledged to fostering and propagating the Catholic religion" (*Irish Press*, 12/2/65). McQuaid said: "...I am grateful for the kind defence – an unusual feature in my life", and Coogan replied (15/2/68): "It must be very difficult for you as a public figure, and at the same time a man with human feelings, to have to cope with some of the hurtful reactions which sometimes follow on the execution of your duty... "

When McQuaid had helped another young person, Coogan wrote (2/4/70): "...Needless to say I was deeply impressed by the trouble you took with the case. How you find time for such things in the midst of your many other pre-occupations defeats me...".

There was a birthday tribute to McQuaid in an *Irish Press* editorial (28/7/70) describing him as "ascetic" in his private life, "but in every other aspect

humane, warm-hearted, compassionate to the old and sick, a lover of and loved by children, an Archbishop who is respected and admired by his own clergy because he has ruled justly. *Ecce sacerdos magnus*".

When Backbencher (John Healy) wrote unkindly in the *Irish Times* about McQuaid, Coogan (9/11/70) told him not to be upset: "...You have your friends in journalism too. As they say, or rather sing, in the modern idiom: 'We shall overcome'". The friendship survived Coogan writing, in the *New York Times*, a piece critical of McQuaid's letter on contraception. When McQuaid protested, Coogan replied (22/2/71): "I take your point about your letter on contraception, but I must frankly say that the interpretation I took from it is an honestly-held view...I realise that this unfortunate episode must have hurt your feelings...".

McQuaid's reply (25/2/71) was prompt: "I am grateful for your letter...Of course, I accept that you honestly hold your views. One day you will change them, when you have given yourself time to study and when you pray for the grace to understand. I am always praying for you".

There was a balance in this relationship that was rare in McQuaid's dealings with either priests or laity. His attitude was certainly paternal, but also interested. Coogan wrote (15/4/71): "I was very impressed with your fair-mindedness towards our comments in recent times. It showed an objectiveness and generosity of judgement that could only come from a large mind, if I may say so".

Coogan's final letter (8/9/71) effectively wished McQuaid a speedy and happy retirement: "I'll see to it that no *Irish Press* enquiries are directed to you at Lourdes or Rome. I hope whatever diocesan business you have to conduct is not too wearisome for you and that it will not interfere with what I hope will be a continuing and happy culmination in your present office" (Ar-54).

There was another glowing editorial in the *Irish Press* when he retired (5/1/72) marking his stature in the Dublin archdiocese alongside Archbishops Cullen and Walsh, "illustrious company surely". He was praised for serving his Church and his people for 30 years

with a consistency that sometimes seemed like obstinacy, with a singleness of mind that his critics regarded as a drift towards sectarianism, but with a courage and a vigour and an honesty that will be remembered long after the transient controversies have been forgotten.

Coogan visited McQuaid both in Archbishop's House and in Killiney after retirement, and, on his death, expressed his appreciation:

I found His Grace to be like a large mansion in which while there were many doors one did not attempt to press open (those marked ecumenism, the Trinity ban, censorship, contraception etc) there were very many doors one could and did find readily open – it was, after all, a large mansion – kindness, humour, scholarship, a laser beam, shrewdness and an unrivalled knowledge of human nature (1973:6)

McQuaid twice asked Dowling to "quietly" approach John Healy, the *Irish Times* political columnist, because McQuaid was worried that Healy had committed the sin of blasphemy in his *Backbencher* column. Seeing him as one of his flock, McQuaid worried about his spiritual welfare. Healy wrote in the first piece (30/4/66) with reference to a piece of legislation: "Here we have the idea of a political immaculate conception allied to a sort of divine Godhead from which issued all political and economic graces at one time". McQuaid wrote to Dowling: "I do not know *Backbencher* and I do not wish to make an issue of what I am sure is not intentional blasphemy. I am however his Archbishop". Dowling reassured McQuaid that he would handle Healy "personally" as he knew him quite well, saying, "I do not think he would intentionally blaspheme". Dowling replied (5/5/66) he had met Healy:

"he was surprised by your letter and genuinely shocked that he should have offended, even inadvertently, in this manner, the more so since his ill-judged phrase had obviously pained Your Grace, whom he admires...Some time Your Grace might enlighten him by having a private conversation. You will find him a pleasant fellow, and he would benefit".

McQuaid notes (6/5/66): "Thank you. Would be glad to meet him"(Ar-39). There does not seem to be any record that they ever met.

McQuaid was upset when Healy blasphemed again (Backbencher, 8/8/70):

“...Backbencher compares the ‘perpetuality’ of the Dáil session with perpetual adoration of the Most Blessed Sacrament in the new Oratory, D’Olier St, formerly the Red Bank restaurant. I regret deeply and deprecate formally this shallow imagery that of itself, is a contemptuous reference to adoration of the Blessed Sacrament...”.

Dowling replied that Healy was on holidays in Achill until the end of the month, but he would see him on his return (Ar-50).

The fact that McQuaid had so few dealings with individual journalists is reflected in his much-quoted remarks from the press conference before the Patrician Congress that he “didn’t have horns” and at opening of the Diocesan Press Office when he welcomed them to “the ogre in his den”.

Fehily says the Patrician Congress was McQuaid’s first-ever press conference as Archbishop, and he had to be persuaded. When the journalists arrived, Fehily remembers how “he walked around and introduced himself and he met every single one of them and he was chatting with them and they were absolutely amazed because they had never met him before”. However, he is said to have come across as “friendly and engaging” when he received journalists and photographers at Blackrock College on the afternoon of his appointment in 1940 (Cooney, 1999b:121).

Journalists, generally, have mixed memories of McQuaid. Power knew him "exceptionally well" and he had "gained his confidence from a very early stage". Mac Réamoinn didn't know him at all, but when they were introduced on the plane to Rome, McQuaid said: "Mr. Mac Réamoinn, yes, and then he said to whoever was with him, 'this is the man who berates us for not performing the liturgy properly'. Now, it was a slightly tart remark, for somebody at that level...". Louis McRedmond met him "at most half a dozen occasions, but the relationship was to a degree fairly tense more than once...fairly on the surface, but you were most conscious of him all the time, and you felt he was certainly very conscious of you and of anybody who was dabbling in church things...". Horgan "didn't know him well and I don't know anybody else who did...". Foyle spoke to him once or twice in his office and 'he was very engaging', commending him for his media monitor newsletter and giving financial assistance towards it.

Following a request from McRedmond's editor, Michael Rooney, that McQuaid meet him and look after him at the Council, McQuaid said "I fixed up Louis McRedmond at once, with Mgr. Vallainc [Vatican Press Officer], but have not seen him since, though I said we would help him all we could"(Ar-34). When McRedmond returned home for a while, he thanked McQuaid for his help and McQuaid replied from Rome (10/10/65):

I am sure that you did your best to be accurate and fair, but you are dealing with highly technical and delicate matters. May I say that if you had found it possible to take my advice by consulting Mgr.

O'Connell and Dr. MacMahon you would not have written just as you did on occasions. Much remains to be done after the Council in maintaining a judicial and orthodox outlook, such as some *periti* whom you met do not fully possess (Ar-35).

Foyle told McQuaid (25/7/70) he had defended him against an attack by Feeney in *This Week* magazine, describing Feeney's article as "a most fantastic mixture of fact and fancy, purporting to be a profile". McQuaid noted on Foyle's letter (31/7/70): "Do not be disturbed by the hostility. 'The servant is not greater than his Master'" (Ar-30).

McQuaid refused all invitations to come on television. When invited for *The Person in Question*, on which Conway and Simms had already appeared, and for *Seven Days*, he noted to Dowling: "It is not my intention to go on any TV show" (Ar-42). Power regularly sought interviews, one being when retirement talk was circulating before McQuaid's 75th birthday, but McQuaid recognised a trap and noted: "I have not the least intention of giving anyone an interview" (Ar-49). The Whyte interview (1969), cited several times in this work, was unique and it indicated that McQuaid might have been quite effective if he had relaxed and granted greater media access (Ar-82).

PRIESTS AND LAITY

Explaining the Council

Battelle says it took a lot of preaching and local seminars to make “the faithful” even realise that what had happened was a part of renewal, and was going to be “part of their lives as Catholics and as Christians”. Father C speaks about his experience with some older people even in getting them to accept the new practice of the priest facing the people at Mass. He remembers his early morning weekday Mass, late 1960s. There were normally “fifteen or sixteen people” at it and they were all old ladies. They sat in the centre, but when he started turning to face them “they all moved to the left and right edges of the seats...I think I frightened them by looking at them. That was the way people were, you know.

The Public Image Committee (1964) reported

a great variety of opinion among the faithful concerning the extent to which the vernacular and lay participation should be introduced into the Mass, views varying from ‘no change’ to ‘complete change’. The view of the Commission is that the wishes of the faithful should not be the sole criterion in liturgical reform, but that consideration should also be given to what will be of spiritual benefit, bearing in mind also the welcome given to the vernacular Ritual, even though there had been no previous demand for it (Ar-61).

Involving the laity

Greene had not any difficulty involving the laity, but Dermod McCarthy remembers Rathmines with Michael O'Connell, McQuaid's former secretary, as his parish priest. There were a large number of single people in the parish, working in the city but from the country. They were living in flats and bedsitters and often very lonely, not able to afford trips home at weekends and with few places to socialise apart from pub and launderette. The priests wanted to build a parish centre for them, but funds were short and they asked for volunteers to help, knowing that every profession, skill and craft was well-represented among the parishioners. "We got a response from one carpenter", says McCarthy. He says they felt the church belonged to the clergy: "Leave it to them". He knows many priests tried hard, with little success, to get the laity involved.

Gaughan says participation of the laity can be complex: "They talk about the priests being in charge. They are not, actually. The priests do exactly what the laity want them to do because the laity are in charge and have always been in charge...". Fehily says "you will always get a rush of laity to help in this, that and the other but very often they are not really the ones we are looking for...". Fitz-Patrick also speaks of people who "haunt presbyteries and haunt sacristies". Gill refers to parishes where an effort was made to get the "more qualified" people in but there were others where those who became involved "tended to be the more pious" and "it was the next step up from the sodality". He believes such people would have been subservient, "and they may not have been very active elsewhere in the secular world...".

Gill says much depended on the style of the individual priest and there were those who welcomed it, and had no difficulty with any of the changes, while others did not approve.

Consultation

Consultation, as Stack found, was not, and is still not, easy for priests because, under the old seminary system, they were not trained how to consult properly. The Public Image Committee (1964) pointed to "lack of information for laity on state of parish finances and where the money goes" and lack of consultation between priests and laity (Ar-61). Dowling said (1965): "For if some priests failed – and still fail – to communicate with the laity, many of the laity then showed – and still show - a hesitation to communicate with the priest" (Ar-35).

The priest/laity relationship became strained in some Dublin parishes in the mid-sixties as a result of McQuaid's decision to bring in professional fund-raising – what became known as "planned giving". It did not feature in the interviews. Burke Savage (1965b:306) said McQuaid thought long before taking this step, understanding that some people would regard it with distaste and see it as open to abuse and to the charge of pressurised giving. Dunn (1986:28) says one of McQuaid's biggest headaches was

getting the clergy to accept planned giving. [McQuaid] engaged a professional group called Wells to help the parishes raise money for the new churches he wished to build in an expanding diocese. Parish

priests who were reluctant to adopt the new system had to be sent a stiff reminder – ‘Get Wells cards’, as they were christened by the jokers of the time.

Carty saw planned giving as the occasion for a “localised breakdown in lay-clerical relationships”. It had been accepted readily in some parishes, but had cut divisions across others. At that stage half of Dublin’s 113 parishes had planned giving and the respective bishops said there was some also in Waterford, Limerick, Galway and Belfast, but not in Cork. An indication of a new openness resulting from planned giving was that parishes published and displayed their financial details in the church porch (1967d).

COMMUNICATION AS A CULTIVATION STRATEGY

Style and effect

McQuaid had a low speaking voice and, in public, it was hard to hear him. He preferred to address people through his pastoral letters. However, controversies arising from his statements show he got his messages across: “He was incapable of spin and to me that is ten out of ten. Because I can’t stand spin” (Gaughan).

Commins (23/11/63) told McCann that McQuaid

“...is not gifted – or burthened [sic] others might say – with the faculty of projecting his presence or expressing his views in a manner designed to win sympathy...He seems to be temperamentally

incapable of 'padding'...it is not in his nature 'to coat the pill' and this can often be a costly drawback (Ar-2).

McQuaid was a prolific letter writer. MacMahon (1998:389) recalls him writing up to six letters within five to ten minutes between each caller, of whom there might be ten on a typical morning or afternoon, and, in interview, MacMahon says he also used the telephone a lot. There were no photocopiers until the final years, so only letters needed for future reference were retained, sometimes rewritten by McQuaid, sometimes copied by his secretaries.

MacMahon agrees McQuaid was not "today's type of communicator". For Fitz-Patrick, "it was a public relations problem with McQuaid," and he was open and compassionate, but couldn't communicate. Power suggests McQuaid realised he was a poor communicator and that is why he often chose silence, and then set up the Diocesan Press Office.

Spoken word

Interviewees refer to McQuaid's mannerisms when preaching, such as flicking each page of his script to the ground as he finished it (Murray, Battelle, Father A) and Father A noticed that he seemed to take medication, periodically popping into his mouth what seemed to be a pill. Others say it was a lump of sugar, as he believed that was the best means to keep up energy levels during long, often stuffy ceremonies. Murray notes how instead of bringing the microphone closer so that he could be heard, he

would push it even further away. Likewise, Fagan says that whenever McQuaid spoke at a function in Mater Dei, they had a microphone and loudspeaker prepared for him, but "he ignored them...You couldn't hear him beyond the first two rows, but nobody dared tell him that".

Battelle believes McQuaid went through "terrible agony" when he had to preach: "It was magnificent stuff but you couldn't understand it because it was too theological for the ordinary people...". Murray says his sermons were very difficult to listen to but people did listen "because he had a kind of presence...".

McQuaid asked Morris (28/2/60) to excuse him from speaking at his consecration as Archbishop of Cashel. "I do not even know who will be present and I do not speak with any facility, but have to prepare everything very carefully"(Ar-6). When asked for a panegyric following the death of Bishop James Staunton of Ferns, McQuaid, from his holidays, noted (5/7/63): "As I am coming back from Switzerland and dependent on planes, should like to be absolved from Mass. To preach a panegyric would mean giving the whole of one week I have for holidays"(Ar-7).

Written word

McQuaid issued pastoral letters with the Lenten regulations, as most bishops did, and they were read aloud in every church of the diocese. Likewise, there were letters for certain occasions. Louis McRedmond says: "For some reason or another, he chose to address his people on the great

subjects every Lent in impenetrable language that nobody bothered with because they couldn't make out what it was about". Scott thought the pastoral letters were "quite good" but he didn't read them often. For Fitz-Patrick, they were "fire and brimstone" and "impersonal".

The Public Image Committee (1964) urged McQuaid to "aim at writing pastoral letters which are short and simple, written with a majority in mind who have only had Primary education...". It was their view that the Lenten Regulations did not "appear to serve their intended purpose, as they are considered too long, too detailed and too-minatory in tone"(Ar-61).

Priests were often critical of the pastorals. They did nothing in terms of communication for Father A: "...effectively turgid, thomistic philosophy and theology". Butler felt they were "fine for theologians but what we wanted were Lenten pastorals for the kitchen floor." Father C found them boring: "Elegantly but obscurely written like they wouldn't have thrilled anybody...but that was part of his role and I think most bishops were the same then. They were expected to be solemn".

The *Irish Press* and *Irish Independent* published excerpts from the bishops' pastorals at the beginning of Lent but waited until the following week to publish McQuaid's pastoral in full, with up to 150 footnote scriptural references in tiny type at the end. McQuaid had let it be known to editors that they were not obliged to report his words at all, but, if they did, he

requested they publish in full, without any summarising or editing. They obeyed.

Dowling tried to get McQuaid to accept publication of excerpts and summaries of his statements and letters. Having first told him how he admired some of his addresses, he then did a compilation of excerpts (9/7/70):

I do appreciate Your Grace's abhorrence of having your carefully fashioned addresses butchered. On the other hand, if one regards each address in its entirety, as a necklace, where each part fits, has its own place and complements each neighbouring point, it is, I suggest still possible to extract an individual gem which, of itself, is worthy of admiration, in the enclosed selection of excerpts which I have tried to do. I hope you do not think my efforts clumsy.

McQuaid was not impressed: "Excerpts returned. You are a simple man to see 'treasures' in these excerpts"(Ar-50).

11: RELATIONAL CHANGE, 1959-1972

THIS CHAPTER considers relational outcomes, that is, changes in strength of the indicators within the three sets of relationships. It is concerned with changes that might have resulted, or at least been influenced, by the manner in which McQuaid handled the Council issue. Such changes were not easy to detect in the general stakeholder groups but were clearer among those who were aware or active publics with regard to the Council and its aftermath. It can be argued that the attitudes towards McQuaid of those who were aware or active on the Council were more influenced by the manner in which the media covered it than by any actions or words of McQuaid.

Corish saw the 1960s as a time of change in Ireland. At the conclusion of our interview he looked down the stairs at Maynooth College, and said again to me: "Communication, that is what it was all about, remember, communication". He found that by 1972

"...things were happening to 'Irish Catholicism' that nobody had anticipated only a decade before. The reasons for the change passed under the general name of 'Vatican II'. But this was a great simplification of a complex cultural change to what now began to appear as an unexpectedly fragile inheritance. A society that had been in many ways static was thrown open to what were quite literally winds of change. At times, they seemed gales of change"(1985:vii).

Gill asks if the Council was a cause or an effect of change and considers that, in the light of changes across Europe and filtering into Ireland, the Council was the "effect of a movement that had already started" and he instances new thinking in the liturgy, ecumenism and the nature of the Church. For Masterson, the Council was just "one potent factor in a dramatic process of change" and he places it alongside the many other factors for change in the 1960s: Ireland moving from being an agricultural to an industrialised country, from de Valera's conception of Ireland to the much more pragmatic "can-do", five-year plan approach of Lemass, the application for admission to the then European Economic Community, the opening of Irish television and the access to non-Irish television. Masterson comments that the Church was very conservative in Ireland, and

I am sure the Archbishop [McQuaid] was enormously influential in so many respects, but what began to happen in the 60s, in respect of change of perception, wasn't just a result of the Vatican Council, although that was one of the important things, it was part of a general ferment of change.

Fuller tried to determine whether the changes of the 1960s came from decisions taken at local Irish Church level, or from the changed thinking in the world after Vatican II, or from political and socioeconomic developments in Ireland from the late 1950s (2002:xii). She took a wider brief than this research, tracing Irish Catholicism from 1950 to 1979, but it was clear that one could not be definite as to the answer. Hoban believes traditional Catholicism was dying long before Vatican II or *Humanae Vitae*:

"because the world was changing, people were changing, wisdom was becoming less amenable to pre-packaged dogma. An authority of rank was giving way to an authority of competence"(2004:117).

CHANGE IN McQUAID

Horgan gives credit to McQuaid for trying to change, trying to improve his relationships, giving the National Stadium meeting and the World Communications Day Mass, both in 1967, as examples:

He was very conscious of the modern world, didn't much like it, but knew it was there, had to be engaged with and by the end it wasn't that he didn't want to engage, or shut himself up and have nothing to do with anybody, he did try but at a time when he was incapable of learning the language or doing the business...

There were changes in McQuaid, some of which, especially in the area of ecumenism were mainly gesture but sincere, while others indicated a deeper shift in attitude. In several instances, as has been seen, he indicated that he did not want his critics to believe they had forced change out of him. The growth of his friendship with the Simms family is an example of his attitude changing. Another sign was when he thanked Burke Savage (16/1/64) for giving him the life of John Gregg [Church of Ireland Archbishop of Armagh]: "It will help me further to understand these good people"(Ar-79).

Evidence has been shown of McQuaid's change in attitude not just to the Simms family but to other dignitaries of the Church of Ireland, and in his

courteous manner of reply to invitations and sending representatives to their liturgical events in later years. Two months before his resignation, he sent Mgr. Hurley to the "Annual Citizenship Service" at Christchurch Cathedral. As Dean Salmon said: "The purpose is to commend the people of Dublin, their work and lives, to God. I enclose a copy of the form of service used last year to give you some idea of the proceedings. For many years we have remembered the two archbishops of Dublin in our prayers". McQuaid's note (23/10/71) on Salmon's letter: "*Quid in casu?* [what are we prepared to do for the cause] I have asked Mgr Hurley to be present"(Ar-8).

It has also been seen how, in 1970, he declined Louis McRedmond's approach for an *Irish Times* interview but his letter, effectively also to the Editor of the *Irish Times*, showed a new courtesy to that paper and to McRedmond and a trust that they would have done a fair job in the proposed articles (Ar-53).

MacMahon says McQuaid "probably" changed in his attitudes over these years, "but not radically, gradually he became adjusted to change, but...I would say he was always on the lookout". Murray remarks that McQuaid was gone six years after the Council ended and many of the instructions for its implementation only came during the 1970s, "in a sense the picture was only just beginning to be clear". Murray stresses change was not just about things like liturgical reform, "it was about attitudes that had to change" and he does not know how far McQuaid's attitudes changed. Father A did not

detect change in McQuaid as a result of the Council, "No, he just kept on his own, ploughing his own furrow...".

Fagan's description of how McQuaid reacted to the Marist Fathers in Milltown being the first to have their altar refurbished to enable the priest to say Mass facing the people was an example of McQuaid approving of change, but not admitting it directly. Gallagher's experience in designing the new churches for Belfield and Glasnevin also illustrates McQuaid's change to acceptance of, and even enthusiasm for, a new church architecture.

Power (e-mail 2/10/02) says:

The implementation of the Vatican II decrees did not change the Archbishop, although some of them might have gone against the grain with him. I think particularly of the replacement of the Latin Tridentine Mass by the vernacular and the reception of Holy Communion in the hand.

Power points, however, to McQuaid's change in handling the media through establishing the Diocesan Press Office in 1965, "it surprised everybody because he was the first, he was innovative in the sense that he appointed a press officer". Gill does not think the Council changed McQuaid at all. Maeve McRedmond believes that when he made his "No Change" address in December 1965, it was true, "nothing had changed in Ireland".

Feeney judged McQuaid to have become a celebrity "merely by remaining consistent and refusing to change" and believed "by the end of his reign he personally had not changed but others had, including many who had been fanatic a decade earlier"(1974:79). McQuaid stood out, for Feeney, as "the personal embodiment of all that the new breed of liberals despised and were embarrassed by and of all that many confused and frightened laity loved and regretted for its passing".

ARCHBISHOP AND PRIESTS

Battelle says the relationship between archbishop and priests was the same in 1972 as it had been in 1956 when he was ordained, but accepts McQuaid was becoming "less effective as the world around him changed". He believes "there would have been a mood for change" among the younger men towards the end of the 1960s: "Certainly, up to the mid-60s we all had a loyalty to him. We might have given out about this or that which had happened at confirmation, but basically we criticised the parish priests. And sometimes the vicar generals". MacMahon believes McQuaid retained "in principle" the loyalty of the priests, but there were signs that some of them at least were moving in a "more individualistic way...after the Council from about 1966, 1967...largely [the younger priests]". He believes the older priests remained "firmly loyal". Gaughan also testifies to the priests' loyalty: "...the vast body of the parish priests, and the people who were in responsible positions in the diocese, they were loyal to him right to the end..."

Dermod McCarthy says the openness with which he spoke to McQuaid as a student changed after ordination. He was impressed by his earlier meetings with him, but not by "that whole episode about the nuns [Radharc]". McCarthy thinks McQuaid "very much lost control as the torch was passed to a new generation of people. Even before he retired it was already passing, people were realising that this was a man for a different age...". He says the

"loyalty of the senior priests was certainly unquestioning all the time but there were quite a number of junior priests who were beginning to say: 'Listen, this is a different age'...He had become an anachronism because he did not move on. As time moved on he did not, perhaps could not, read the signs..."

Father A also had a good relationship from student days, but says "things were very much more formal [after ordination]. The older kind of familiarity when he asked you to call and see him, that was all gone...He was much more distant. I didn't really have much dealings with him...". Murray's relationship with McQuaid "improved over the years", especially when he knew him in Mater Dei.

Connell says he "had nothing but the most formal relations" with McQuaid, adding: "I was never in Killiney". He knows the relationship was cool in the early days because of "a certain interpretation of my desire to change my appointment", but after 1966 there was an improvement when McQuaid was impressed by his three-part critique in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* of

Dewart's book, *The Future of Belief*, and "let it be known" he was pleased with his stance for orthodoxy (Connell 1967, 1968a, 1968b).

Ward did not find any deterioration in his relationship with McQuaid and says he didn't "have very much contact with him". He suggests that "...in terms of thinking, [McQuaid] was very admirable, in terms of style he was probably from another era...". Fehily cannot recall "any great change" in McQuaid's relationship with the priests, and for himself, despite the manner in which he was removed from the DICS, "the more I got to know him, the more I admired him".

Father C says the impression he and "some of the priests" had was that "as regards Vatican II, Dublin was nearly the slowest diocese to respond". He admits his own relationship with McQuaid deteriorated over interpretation of Council changes.

Fagan says diocesan priests were loyal and kept a fairly united front as a team, but "they were criticising behind his back". Fagan doubts if McQuaid changed much, certainly "he was still the same as far as doctrine was concerned". As for lay people, Gay Byrne believes the priests were loyal to McQuaid "right up to the end". Power believes McQuaid held the respect of most of the priests, with the exception of "a very small number", adding: "Apart from minor hiccups there was generally an amicable relationship between priests and archbishop...". Gallagher was personally loyal and remained an admirer of McQuaid, but he saw reason for certain younger

priests' impatience: "I think they were quite right. You don't want to stay in office too long".

The archives show change for the worse in the relationships between McQuaid and the Radharc priests Dunn, Forristal and Dermod McCarthy. But there was also change on the priests' side, that Forristal would write to McQuaid in July 1970 and ask him to change his mind when McCarthy was moved from Radharc to Athy. The fact that McQuaid replied, even if it were to refuse the request, could suggest that he preferred people who questioned him (Ar-26).

The interviews confirm that McQuaid retained, to the end, the unquestioning loyalty of the older, and many younger priests. In some cases the relationship was consolidated because they felt media criticism of him was extreme and unfair. The strength of some younger priests' relationships with him weakened as they believed he was no longer in touch with the changing world, and was showing this in lack of enthusiasm and apparent reluctance to implement change. Also, the move to hasten his resignation showed these priests' impatience with him. Reluctance to implement the Council seems to have been a general impression, but at the end he did everything as instructed by Rome, and as decided by the bishops. His caution against changing anything before being sure that the change was for the better, is undisputed. It was in his conservative nature, a conservatism that was shared by a lot of lay people whom he did not want to upset. He saw a wider audience in his diocese than those who read *The Furrow* and

Doctrine & Life, or Horgan in *The Irish Times* or McRedmond in the *Irish Independent*.

ARCHBISHOP AND LAITY

The Public Image Committee reported a change in the laity as early as 1964 and noted the influence of the media:

It would seem that prior to the Council most Irish lay people took it for granted that there was an official line on most, if not all problems, and that Bishops more or less all held the same views without having to arrive at them by discussion. The Vatican Council, as reported by the Press, presented a very different picture. The laity may now have tended, understandably perhaps, to go to the extreme. The influence of the Vatican Council among the educated and influential classes in Ireland appears to have been very great"(Ar-61).

McQuaid would probably say this was more true of the intellectual, usually middle-class Catholics, as indicated from a comment at the first meeting of the Public Image Committee (24/1/64) that "we must be careful not to confine our deliberations to the opinions of the 'intellectuals'", whereupon McQuaid, "expressing abhorrence of the term, agreed that it would be important to ascertain the opinion of the community at large and of all groups and sections as such"(Ar-61).

Dowling, in his *Pax Romana* paper (24/10/65), considering the suggestion that many bishops had been at fault through over-control, said it was

certainly true "that many laymen, writers, journalists and others, Catholics among them, have compounded the problem by a lack of respect", and these people "would appear to have forgotten that they are not the bishops' peers: in whatever other attributes they may approximate, or excel them, that they have not the assistance of the Holy Spirit". Dowling continued:

Yet, capitalising on what skills they possess, they have not hesitated to insult the bishops – and even the Pope – with sarcastic comment, sometimes manifesting an adolescent delight in irreverences and theologising on such sensitive issues as birth control, seminary training, war and peace, and clerical celibacy. And running through most of it, has been the cultivated sneer of the professional intellectual (Ar-35).

Louis McRedmond says his own attitude towards McQuaid changed through 1959 to 1972 and he noticed a general change among the laity. He says at the start it wouldn't "even have occurred to me to contradict a bishop...by the later 1960s, I was quite prepared to challenge outright". He believes people realised McQuaid couldn't silence them, as he could silence clerics and sees this as a sign that the old fear among the laity was disappearing. He recalls an article written by a senior civil servant, Seán O'Connor, with his Minister's approval, for *Studies* (1968). It looked to changes in the post-primary school system with a demand for new schools and the extension of existing schools. There would be increased numbers of pupils and at the same time a shrinkage in vocations for the priesthood and for the teaching brothers. This would mean increased responsibility for lay

teachers but there were difficulties while so many schools were run by the clergy. The archives confirm McRedmond's recollection that Fr. Peter Troddyn, Burke Savage's successor as editor of *Studies*, and Fr. Cecil McGarry, his Jesuit Provincial, defied McQuaid's wish for the article to be withdrawn (Ar-57). McRedmond sees it as "an interesting example of both laity and clergy outfacing the archbishop in a way that certainly would not have happened ten years earlier...".

The *Humanae Vitae* controversy, from 1968, showed not just some priests, but many of the laity also, going against pope and archbishop and making up their own minds about contraception. Foyle saw this as a major turning point, that they now felt they could "disobey with impunity" without fear of punishment, in purgatory or in hell as they would have in earlier years. Maeve McRedmond saw a change in people's attitudes towards McQuaid, "and this is probably why *Humanae Vitae* didn't get the blanket acceptance he thought it should have because people had started to think for themselves and challenge...".

Power does not think "any of the people ever lost respect for him because it was a time when we all had grown up in a very conservative atmosphere". Power (e-mail 2/10/02) elaborates: "My relationship with the late archbishop remained excellent up to the time of his death. There was always a great mutual respect between us...". Gallagher says the Archbishop took an interest in him from his schooldays and "that relationship remained" and he admired McQuaid "possibly stronger" after the Council than before it.

An interesting relationship change was between McQuaid and certain members of the Knights of St. Columbanus. Grogan's strong call for *aggiornamento*, efforts to create a more liberal and reforming agenda in the Order, and abolition of the secrecy which had surrounded the Knights, did not appeal to McQuaid. Traditionally, McQuaid had built up close friendships with Supreme Knights, such as Stafford Johnson and Dermot O'Flynn, and these friendships remained strong, but it was different with Grogan.

Grogan wrote to McQuaid (18/8/66) presenting his "respectful compliments" and seeking an opportunity to call on him. McQuaid (20/8/66) instructed his secretary, Fitzpatrick, to say: "I am directed by HGAB [His Grace the Archbishop] to thank you for this first intimation of your election in June. On return from Lourdes, HG will arrange to see you". Reference to "first intimation" shows McQuaid was not pleased and it broke the traditional practice of writing personally to Supreme Knights (Ar-80).

Grogan wrote to McQuaid (13/9/66):

"I know how fully occupied you are at present, and appreciate that it may be some time before you are free to see me. In the meantime, there is one matter of some urgency on my mind: The appointment of a Supreme Chaplain. It is the privilege of the Supreme Knight for the time being – subject to ecclesiastical approval – to nominate his Chaplain.

I should very much like to invite Rev. James Kavanagh to take the office. He is an old friend: we were at O'Connell School together..."

McQuaid's note (14/9/66): "I agree". Fitzpatrick sent the reply to Grogan (16/9/66)(Ar-80).

Grogan wrote to Fitzpatrick (20/9/66) thanking McQuaid for agreeing to Kavanagh's appointment. A further letter, Grogan to McQuaid (22/9/66), stated Kavanagh had accepted, but Grogan added: "He told me he was influenced by my address on the occasion of our Banquet, of which I believe Your Grace received a copy. I find Fr. Kavanagh's reaction very gratifying and hope we can attain the standards I am endeavouring to establish"(Ar-80).

This shows a change from the reverential tone of previous Supreme Knights' letters to McQuaid. Kavanagh had been one of McQuaid's most trusted helpers in his governance of the diocese – Chairman of DICS, and member of the Vigilance Committee and Public Image Committee, among other responsibilities. This letter indicates he was on Grogan's side and supported the changes Grogan was advocating.

McQuaid eventually agreed to meet Grogan, MacMahon writing (9/3/67): "The Archbishop asks me to write to you concerning your request some time ago, on becoming Supreme Knight, to call on His Grace. "His Grace is

free tomorrow, Friday, 10th inst, at twelve noon, should it be convenient for you to call"(Ar-80).

This was nearly seven months after Grogan's request for the meeting. The letter could not have reached Grogan before Friday morning. Was McQuaid expecting Grogan might not be free at such short notice or might not receive the letter in time? There is not any note in the archives about this meeting. Was there a connection between this sudden summons to Archbishop's House and Grogan's intention to participate in a *Seven Days* television programme about the Knights later that month?

After Grogan's accession, McQuaid does not seem, from the archives, to have attended Knights' functions. Grogan, however, attended the episcopal consecration in 1968 of Bishop Carroll, another classmate from O'Connell School (Ar-7). When Luke Curran succeeded Grogan in 1969 there was not any sign of re-building the McQuaid/Knights relationship and there was one embarrassing misunderstanding over a fund-raising request (Ar-80).

The change in McQuaid's relationship with Frank Duff and the Legion of Mary was different. From the cloud which seemed to surround them in the early 1960s and Duff's reluctance to accept the Papal Knighthood, McQuaid came unambiguously to their support when there was a suggestion that the Fathers at the Council seemed to be raising questions. Then there was the glittering ceremony with the Nuncio's congratulations, the Bishops sending

Duff a letter praising him for being steadfast, and McQuaid preaching the sermon for the Golden Jubilee in 1971, just four months before his retiral.

The change to a more independent stance by politicians against the bishops, with both sides still remembering the Mother and Child controversy, cannot be totally attributed to the Council. It had started before the Council. The failure in 1959 of the Bishops' lobby against legislation to ease alcohol licensing laws and extend Sunday opening hours was the first time they were defeated by a Government in such a way (Ar-6).

Through the 1960s there were indications of less consultation between ministers and bishops, despite McQuaid's assertion to Whyte that there was "no contention" (Ar-82). For instance, the Bishops' Standing Committee (9/1/68) expressed "astonishment" that the report of the Dáil Committee on the Revision of the Constitution should

contain the proposal concerning divorce, that the Committee should have reached such a decision on this matter without any consultation whatsoever with the Catholic hierarchy, and that it should have invoked in favour of the proposal the authority of Vatican Council II which describes divorce as a plague, and which teaches that the marriage relationship, by Divine Will, and in the eyes of Society, too, is a lasting one (Ar-12).

In the final years McQuaid was frequently left out of consideration on serious issues. It has been seen how he thought at first he had the full

picture on the implications of the proposed merger between UCD and Trinity for the Trinity ban. But he was to change his mind when Browne of Galway told him the ban on Trinity "would go"(Ar-7). He expressed his "amazement" (10/2/69) at the statement that the ban would go: "I am the more grateful for Your Lordship's letter in that I have been kept in the dark"(Ar-7).

PRIESTS AND LAITY

Lay perspective

For Lovatt-Dolan, one of the big changes was "the new model of Church. This involved a move, certainly in my life, from working for people to working with people". Mac Réamoinn says the word "church", as meaning the institution and even just the ministry, has faded only since Vatican II, although one still hears people saying, "she has a son in the Church", or, "I have a friend in the Church". On preaching, Mac Réamoinn doesn't think the standard has gone up, but in many cases it has gone down. He doesn't link that to Vatican II, so much as an attempt to speak more directly on contemporary issues. Mac Réamoinn thinks the catechetical instruction was a "tremendous loss" because

a great number of people who go to Mass regularly, and would regard themselves as Catholic, have only the sketchiest notion and would not be able to distinguish all that much between matters of faith and what you might call matters of devotion and perhaps getting dangerously near superstition.

Foyle says the big change between laity and the priests following the Council was that:

...we got permission to be deviant, in every way. Previous to that we were conscious of sinning if we did anything non-compliant. Suddenly we saw fellows on television being non-compliant. And clergy at it. So we all got in on the act. And you found the unfortunate bishops couldn't say, apart from the conspicuous one of Trinity College, 'under pain of mortal sin'. They stopped using those words. And nothing was under pain of any sort. And suddenly we realised that we were dealing with toothless tigers, or dogs who could bark but couldn't bite.

Foyle says *Humanae Vitae* "opened the floodgates". He saw change in the laity but also change in the priests: "They didn't know what was going on. They took their eye off the ball...they lost sight of what their job is...the big saving is saving people from purgatory. That's all".

Brophy says the great new idea from Vatican II was that "the laity are the Church, too" and this was an "astounding revelation" after a couple of hundred years of domination. Gay Byrne did not see much change in the priests/laity relationship but the Church did change and attitudes changed. He questions the influence of the *Late Late Show* and says it was hard to judge, especially for people like him, who were in the middle of it all. He says it is very hard to answer whether or not television, and in particular the *Late Late Show* was the overall influence. Louis McRedmond (1982:93) emphasised the theme that each and all were the Church, the People of God,

taking “the laity out of a sense of servitude” to being no longer “the malleable objects of an authority which might order us about at will”.

The adoption of the Vatican II spirit of reform and renewal and the removal of secrecy about their identity and their activities led the Knights of St. Columbanus, under Grogan’s leadership, to a more visible role in their parishes. This can be noticed in the tone and intent of resolutions for their Supreme Council meeting, June 1969 which included Resolution 22: “The involvement of the Christian in the life of the local Christian community should be positively inculcated by the Supreme Council in such clear and didactic language that, despite obvious overlapping into the pastoral field of other Catholic action groups, the individual Knight will feel obliged (as part of his Christian duty) to be active in the parish” (Ar-80).

Louis McRedmond sees *Humanae Vitae*, in particular, as signalling a change in the laity and their attitude to bishops and priests. In correspondence, (5/7/03), he draws attention to the *Irish Independent* and how it showed a “progression into growing disappointment with the slow progress of conciliar follow-up in Ireland”. He also detects from that time “a shift from a deferential attitude on church affairs in the country’s biggest [morning] newspaper to an approach which, while still respectful, was based on an assessment of events”. Dermot Keogh (1994:262) believes Vatican II had a “major impact on the way in which many members viewed the Church, the relationship between clergy and laity, the question of religious freedom and

church and state". He, like so many others, pays tribute to the magazines run by religious and diocesan clergy.

Priests' perspective

Stack saw change beginning to happen in the 1960s, and "the formal invitation to involve people in the administration and, indeed, the ministry of parishes in the shape of parish councils, pastoral councils...based on the Council's universal call to holiness". He says:

"this was the beginning of a more familiar, more brotherly and sisterly relationship between priests and lay persons...it is complex because it is related to the changing culture generally – the informalisation of relationships...So, it's not just a church thing, there has been a culture change in relationships and for the most part that has expressed itself in a growing informality and familiarity...".

MacMahon points to change resulting from emphasis on collegiality which started with the bishops becoming a community and then filtered down to parish level. Father B says: "We were the triumphant Church. And, in many ways, I am happier with the Church today with all its faults...a humbler Church. And I find, even in the parish here, a huge sort of supportive attitude".

Battelle "felt" there was

"...not that much change...the relationship between the priest and people was beginning to thaw a little bit. Now, whether that had anything to do with the Council or whether it had to do with people coming through a newer education system, with more people being educated, or not ...".

Father C thinks the majority of priests were "mellowed by contact with lay people, so that they were prepared to be flexible when it came to the crunch" with issues like *Humanae Vitae* and how they advised people in confession. He says there was definitely a fall away, "not just of liberal people, but a fall away of very conservative people...For some it was too much too sudden, they didn't know the difference...".

Curtin says there were very few laity who wanted to be involved and to understand theology; he believes "they were not encouraged by the diocesan authorities and, so, the vast majority of them continued as they were". Battelle probably agrees when he says that "for so many of the older people who would have died up to the mid-1970s the Council would have had no impact at all".

Flannery, a Dominican priest, working in a central city church, saw the most obvious change in "the diminution" of numbers attending Mass.

"...I came to Dublin in 1957. In those days the weekday Masses would all be full and Sunday Masses, of course...But what caused what, one can never be sure...The numbers did begin to fall rapidly...When people around you are changing their mind, you are more likely to change yours, and the greater the number of people the faster it is going to happen. That certainly happened. That was the biggest thing in Dublin. Their attitude towards the Church, towards religion, would have changed as well..."

The Public Image Committee (1964) reported "...a marked decline in attendances at Sodalties, Golden Hours and at Evening Devotions generally. Fortunately, devotion to the Mass remains sound"(Ar-61).

Hartigan (2000:335) doesn't "blame" Vatican II for the decline in Dublin's sodalties and confraternities. He traces the decline from the 1920s and 1930s and after as the city population was dispersed to the new working class suburbs. This cut off many of the laity, especially the more devotionally inclined, from the religious orders which were "the mainstay of the confraternity movement in Dublin". Some orders moved to the suburbs in the 1970s but it was too late and "the impact of the Second Vatican Council, the introduction of television into Ireland and the embrace of a secular youth culture made it an impossibility".

Flannery also says that changing things like the language in the Mass was difficult for some but when they were given it they liked it and most of them changed over to it easily. He does not believe it would have been better to consult them before the changes, "it was better just to do it". He also points

to questions like social justice which the Council stressed and clergy and laity picked up: "That would have been the big change because most of the clergy had little understanding of social justice".

12: DISCUSSION

THIS CHAPTER attempts to answer the initial research question: To what extent, if any, did the Archbishop's handling of the Vatican Council issue influence the public relationships between Archbishop, priests and laity. This discussion places the findings within the context of the theoretical principles and processes described in the literature review. It considers the extent to which the findings illustrate good practice in issue and relationship management and how efficiently and convincingly the methodology and research design delivered an answer to the research question. It would seem that the shift in overall stakeholder relationships, if any, could not be attributed to the Council issue, but there was some influence on relationships with aware and active publics. However, there is also evidence that the relationships were seen to be influenced less by what McQuaid did and said, and by how he imposed his teaching authority, than by the media of communication from which priests and laity, certainly those active on the issue, nourished their attitudes to the Council, the Archbishop and the Church.

McQUAID – MAN AND MANAGER

Certitude

The most consistent pattern is McQuaid's apparently unshakeable certitude about everything - his interpretation of Catholic faith, doctrine and morals and his role and duty as bishop to pass on "The Faith" to his people and to

be the sole teaching authority on faith and morals in his diocese. He was concerned when speculative theologians expressed views he did not agree with and he feared they would confuse the "simple faithful". This certitude extended to private conversation where he would never admit there was something he did not know (MacMahon) and where he impressed with an array of encyclopedic knowledge on many and diverse topics (Father B. Murray, Battelle, Greene).

The discovery of the Fahey letter (Ar-5) shows he searched for a similar intellectual certitude in his spiritual life with God, a search for which Fahey admonished him, saying certitude was not possible, but in which he seems to have persisted. Evidence of his worry was shown when he said he was "very frightened of dying" because he did not know how he would answer God's questions at his judgement (Fehily).

Behind it all, there seems to have been an insecurity, influenced, according to Cooney (1999b), by the death of his mother. Gaughan saw his shyness and overbearing manner as a cover for his insecurity, and Bibb & Kourdi suggest that the use of power to control others can often rest upon a personal insecurity (2004:64).

In his last years, his certitude in interpretation of Catholic faith and doctrine was confronted by the direction Vatican II took, with statements and changes, especially in the area of ecumenical practice, which he found "repugnant". The final disillusionment was the haste with which certain

priests, particularly some of the younger ones, wanted, even conspired, to secure his retirement. He died just one year after retirement, apparently ignored by his successor, feeling he was not wanted any more (Father A. Battelle).

Control and direct

McQuaid was seen as a "superb manager", but liable to be influenced by opinions of those whom he trusted (Lehane). His management style was that advocated by many business writers and widely practised in the 1960s – "to significantly control and direct" (Ewing 1987:22). That was the style in government, business and society as well as in the Church (Byrne, Gaughan, Father C, Corish, Stack, Connell and others). McQuaid did not favour the collaborative, symmetrical approach to management that is now more widely advocated (Handy, 1994; Greenhalgh, 2001). McQuaid consulted selected advisers on certain aspects of a question but he, alone, held the complete picture (MacMahon).

He made it clear to the Public Image Committee that authority does not give reasons for its decisions and that there would be "change but not revolution" (Ar-61). Connell confirmed that for McQuaid, change was to be gradual, and, as he said to Burke Savage (Ar-62), he was not going to be forced into change by critics or media. McQuaid expected an obedience based on faith, and, for him, obedience was the test of holiness (Connell). While he was gentle in dealing with the sinner, while deploring the sin, he made an exception when the sin was disobedience (Feeney 1974:85, Cooney

1999b:389). McQuaid obeyed the Pope and the Roman Curia with precision, and from the testimony of several who knew him well, he attained a personal holiness (Butler, Moloney, Battelle, Gallagher, Fehily, Power). Few got behind the mask to find the man who was "very humble" in private (Greene) as distinct from the "theatricality" that was so often shown in public (Stack). He retained in public a stiff, upper lip, and "never wanted to show anybody that basically he had any feelings at all" (Battelle), with the rare exception revealed by Mangan (in Kirby 1990).

In making judgements on this research, one has to remember the distinctive features of management, authority and obedience in the Catholic Church, as considered by Pope Paul VI (1964), McKenzie, Cameron and Müller (1966) and others at the time of the Council.

THE COUNCIL ISSUE

The Council was nearly not an issue, as some of Pope John's advisers tried to calm down his expectations after the "tremendous sense of euphoria" felt at the announcement in January 1959. The Pope's early pronouncements indicated there would be steps towards reunion of the Christian churches and theologians were fuelling these hopes (Küng 1962). As the opening ceremony approached in 1962, there was very little comment. The bishops had responded to circulars from the Roman Curia as to what they wanted raised for discussion and men like McQuaid had been conservative in their replies (Vatican 1960). Stack and others tell how magazines like *The Furrow*

and *Doctrine & Life* kept them and others informed about the more progressive theological thinking in Central and Northern Europe.

On the eve of the Council, Greene is unlikely to have been alone in wondering about the need for it. Butler believed things would change slowly, but it did not need a Council. There were still those like McNamara (1962:viii) and Hurley (1962:35) who were confident of a great step towards Christian unity.

The Irish bishops, and others, expected the Council to be over in one session by Christmas 1962 (Mac Réamoinn). However, from the first week of the first session, something else was happening, as cardinals and bishops disagreed, disputed, amended, and even threw out some of the prepared documents.

So, instead of a great, colourful and triumphal event, there were now two camps of opinion. As an issue, the Council was not just "an unsettled matter which is ready for decision" (Chase 1984:38), but "a matter in dispute" (Lesly 1991:23), and it became linked, not just with one, but with several ongoing issues, like liturgy, scripture and ecumenism, which now involved "disagreements that occur in public" (Hallahan 2001:28). To the conservatives, it was a shock and, they believed, a scandal for the faithful that bishops should disagree in public and that there might be more than one way to interpret the Council.

The media, not allowed access to the secret Council sessions, found out anyway what was being said and they published it. Then, instead of being an impressive, but boring piece of Vatican ceremonial, the Council and its related issues became international news, demonstrating how media involvement determines the way an issue penetrates society (Femers *et al* 2000:256). The Council became a crisis for many conservatives who felt that they had lost control. McQuaid sympathised with Curial viewpoints and indicated his anxieties in his comment on the message from Bishop Joyce (Ar-66). His interventions at the Council, on liturgy and ecumenism, were generally conservative (Vatican 1970, 1972, 1973).

The media did not create the Council as an issue, but they reported it and helped to popularise it. The media, including the Irish, were generally pro-Council. There were now protagonists and antagonists, liberals and conservatives, on every matter for debate, leading McQuaid to hope these labels would be "cast aside as an outdated cloak for want of knowledge or reflection"(Ar-34). McQuaid denied a rift among the bishops, and that "the Council was composed of rival hierarchies engaged in capping one another's contributions"(Ar-32). However, the debates showed that, following Vercic and J.Grunig (2000:42), the conservatives saw the strategic issue of the Council as a problem, the liberals as an opportunity.

Stakeholders and publics

This research leans strongly to the priests and laity as stakeholder groups for the Archbishop and for each other. The priests included sub-groups such as diocesan administrators, parish priests, curates, teachers in schools and universities and trainee priests, i.e. seminarians. The laity included believers who attended Mass and received the Sacraments, held positions within the diocesan administration, were active members of lay organisations such as the Legion of Mary and the Knights of St. Columbanus, as well as believers who did not practise the Catholic religion. Cross-sections of most of these groups have been covered in this research, but in looking at whether McQuaid's handling of the Council issue effected any change in the stakeholder relationships, it is difficult to make a judgement as there were not surveys in those days, apart, possibly, from Biever's work on the relationships between Dublin priests and laity.

One can make the fine distinction between stakeholders and publics, as has been clarified by J.Grunig who sees stakeholders as general categories of people, but publics as those groups, (and indeed, individuals also, in line with certain authors such as Oxley, 1989:35), which arise when organisations make decisions that have consequences for them (2005:778). Grunig developed this distinction from his situational theory of publics. For Grunig, publics come and go as consequences change for them, while stakeholders have greater permanence as groupings.

Publics on the Council issue were not simply liberal and conservative, young and old, priests and laity, but covered all shades of opinion on the issue, among both priests and laity. Publics came, went and came back again. When the divisions first surfaced at the Council the protagonists (liberals, progressives) and antagonists (conservatives, curialists) soon constituted what Hallahan would call "a melodrama in which the parties become actors assuming the roles of heroes, victims and villains"(2001:32).

As the Council progressed, these publics took up different positions on the spectrum that Grunig, deriving from Dewey and Blumer, classified as non-publics, latent publics, aware publics and active publics (1984:143-5). He further classified active publics as all-issue, apathetic, single issue and hot issue (1984:160). McQuaid paid the greatest attention to his largest public, indeed probably a latent public for the whole period, those whom he often referred to as the "simple faithful" whose faith he did not want disturbed by theologians, professional or amateur. The Catholic population of the Dublin Archdiocese rose from 691,000 in 1959 to 725,000 in 1966 and an estimated 815,000 in 1972 (ICD 1960, 1967, 1973). The vast majority of these people would have been in the "simple faithful" category, not having much knowledge of theology nor understanding of the theological issues that arose at the Council. McQuaid knew the very active publics, especially the all-issue publics, were a minority of priests and of educated laity and believed they could look after themselves.

Shifts in stakeholder relationships might be detected, but caution is needed in relating them to McQuaid's handling of the Council issue as cause and effect. Shifts in relationships with publics arising from the Council issue might seem easier to detect, but not necessarily, because these publics were fluid, starting with the bishops of the world, including McQuaid and his Irish colleagues, who were not necessarily all-issue publics, but favouring some changes and opposing others. This illustrates Battram's reference to the autopoietic and vital urges that co-exist in all people making it rare for them to be absolutely liberal or absolutely conservative (1998:143-4). While the early debates seemed to indicate almost a state of rebellion against the Curia, a common faith prevailed, and, by the end of the Council all of the documents had been voted through by very large majorities, with McQuaid believed to have been with the majority in all cases.

Issue management

The Chase/Jones issue management model can be seen as a tool for analysis rather than a rigid standard. Chase saw the issue management process in five steps: issue identification, issue analysis, issue change strategy options, issue action programming and evaluation of results (1984:36ff). As it was designed to bridge the gap between business and society, it does not fit entirely into the context of religious governance where faith is the glue and, if there is a gap with society, it is of a different nature. However, it is worth examining the points of contact.

In terms of "issue identification", McQuaid was slow to recognise the Council as an issue, as were other Irish bishops who were not ready for it, and probably never grasped it, as seen in Commins' highly critical reports for the Government (Ar-2). There is evidence that when the issue surfaced suddenly in the first session, McQuaid, leading the Irish Hierarchy because of D'Alton's illness, began to apply his typical diligence and analysis. Archives show McQuaid's meticulousness in responding to Vatican circulars and documentation and that he sought to build alliances with the English and Scottish bishops, as well as those from North America, Australia and New Zealand where there was a strong Irish influence. MacMahon is certain that "at the time and for the five years or so that were left to him after the Council", the Council was an issue of central importance for McQuaid. He said very little in public about the Council, apart from some pastoral letters, but it was a constant preoccupation behind the scenes. His gifts to Simms of Wenger's books on the Council and the final documents, show that he appreciated the Council and was keen to spread its messages (Ar-8).

In terms of what could be described as "strategy change options" he seemed to adopt a reactive strategy at first, being on the defensive and fearing the position was getting out of control. There were soon some signs of a mixed adaptive approach, as seen in his March 1963 pastoral letter on the Council when he accepted each bishop was not "at one with all his fellow bishops" but this had occurred at every previous Ecumenical Council owing to "necessary diversity of emphasis and phrasing" but at the end it should

show forth "the glory of the Church of Christ". He remained reluctant to adapt, and he did not give leadership on the question. Mangan said McQuaid found the Council "difficult" and didn't adapt to it as well as some other bishops did (in Kirby 1990:319) and several interviewees were sharper, e.g. Gill, Stack, Greene, Gaughan, McRedmond and Masterson. To the end, he obeyed Council decisions and directives issued by the Pope, but there was little evidence of proactive strategy and enthusiasm.

In terms of "issue action programming" he took a number of direct steps, being the first bishop in Ireland to open a diocesan press office and establishing a diocesan council of priests earlier than most others, specifically as a result of Council decisions. He seems to have taken seriously the report of the Public Image Committee and over the next three years he seemed more willing to change (Ar-61). He distrusted the orthodoxy of the new approaches to the Protestant churches, but he obeyed, while expressing his views forthrightly behind the scenes. He was seen by Louis McRedmond, in particular, as strong on the gestures but not committed to the substance of the changes.

Issue managers look to the importance of "forecasting the likely future impact of issues on an organisation" and advising management how to respond to them (T.Traverse-Healy 1994:3). McQuaid was always a man of strategic foresight, planning for the future and anticipating needs as in the areas of social welfare services, education, health and expansion of Dublin city. Butler and Lovatt-Dolan commended him for anticipating the drugs

issue and acting on it long before anybody else in Irish society. On the message from the Council that the Catholic Church must engage with the modern world, McQuaid could not bring himself to see it as an opportunity, but was always on the defensive, more concerned about the dangers to the faith of his people.

Judging the success or failure of the Council is still difficult, even after forty years. There is still confusion as it meant different things to different people. Father C holds that patience is still needed, the Catholic Church is an old institution and has always moved slowly, and history alone will show if the Council was a success or a failure. To the liberals, the Council was at first seen as a success with many changes in discipline and the interpretation of doctrine, bringing in a certain element of democracy and openness, emphasising that the entire People of God, the laity with Pope, bishops and priests, are the Church. There seemed to be a drawing-back after *Humanae Vitae* in 1968 which, some would say, continued through the pontificate of John Paul II (1979-2005). McQuaid's personal management of the Council issue was a success in that the changes were made in Dublin and, as he told the Pope, the faithful remained "in very greatest proportion, true to the Faith, and the practice of the Faith"(Ar-18). Some other bishops in the world could not claim this outcome.

The issue life cycle

The findings have followed the four development stages – emergence, dissemination, establishment and erosion – and their attribution of a strong influence to intermediary groups, especially the media (Femers *et al* 2000:255). The transition points between the phases fit conveniently into the Council history – emergence (1959), dissemination (1962), establishment (1965) and erosion (1968). It is obvious, however, that as in the biological life cycle, where the change from child to adult is gradual, there is not a sharp break-off but overlaps between phases. It would appear that the appropriate depiction for the Council issue is cyclical rather than linear, as it did not erode like a consumer product, but has continued amidst other issues with its actors having recurring but different and often divergent experiences of it.

Analysis through the Femers life cycle

Wartik & Heugens see issue life cycle models lacking in “descriptive accuracy and theoretical rigour”, but argue for them to continue to be perceived as useful tools (2003:134). Femers *et al* consider the use of alternative and/or combined strategies of encouragement and discouragement through the four stages of the issue life cycle (2000:255). Such an analysis expresses McQuaid’s typical strategies with the Council issue, more often behind the scenes to fellow bishops and to Rome, often a case of “yes, but...” or “no, but...”. There was very little public management of the Council to his priests and people but, taking evidence from the four

stages of emergence, dissemination, establishment and erosion, some instances and patterns can be noticed.

Emergence

At first, the Council was not fully appreciated by McQuaid or other Irish bishops. Hierarchy minutes fail to mention it during the months leading to the opening in October 1962 apart from asking people to pray for its success. There was no explanation of what the Council might be about, nor invitation to contribute views and ideas about it (Ar-10 and ICD, 1963).

Dissemination

McQuaid, at the start of the Council played down extreme hopes, warning what "not to expect" and reiterating his views on Protestants having to turn "towards the only truth". However, he was encouraging at the same time in saying he would accept its decrees and loyally execute its commands (Ar-65). He was alarmed at the liberal trends in the first session but then set about trying, unsuccessfully, to arrange lectures for the Irish bishops so they would be better informed next session. McQuaid continued the outreach lectures for adults, which now began to deal with Council topics among others, but the older priests were not always supportive, as Father B found. There was praise for McQuaid's role in the Radharc film unit, which anticipated the importance of television. He kept it under his control, but did not interfere with the subjects covered, not even the programmes on the dissatisfaction of nuns after the Council. In 1963, he established a Centre of Religious Studies and Information to inform non-Catholics and help lay

people understand theology, but warned Burke Savage, its director, that he did not want it "confused as an ecumenical gesture" or another measure of *aggiornamento* "wrung from the Archbishop" by the criticism of journalists and others (Ar-62). He established the Public Image Committee (1964) to find from his priests what really was the image of the Church (and himself) in Dublin and what changes were needed. People would have been encouraged if they had known about this but he insisted on absolute secrecy (Ar-61). He set up the Diocesan Press Office and won praise for it, but then kept too firm a control on it, deciding all policy, allowing little latitude to Dowling and often, to Dowling's embarrassment and humiliation, not keeping him properly informed (Ar-39). He gave tacit approval to the Marist Fathers' new altar in Milltown and said nothing but sent parish priests to have a look at it before re-organising their own parish churches.

Establishment

He gave his "No Change" address about Council changes not "worrying the tranquillity of your Christian lives" but assured, again, that all of its decrees and subsequent directives would be fully obeyed (Ar-38). He accepted changes but would, as far as possible, dictate the pace of their implementation in his diocese, despite criticism. He did not say that he was acting strictly in accord with Cardinal Lercaro's secret instruction (Ar-11). He went along with Burke Savage's idea for the Mansion House ecumenical meeting, and was again praised, but he did not react to the situation when the seating arrangements went chaotic and he could easily have invited Simms up to the empty chair on the platform (Ar-79). He set up the

Diocesan Council of Priests but rendered it ineffective by appointing all of the initial members and emphasising they were merely a consultative body. He met Archbishops Ramsey and Simms at Archbishop's House, but resisted and then grudgingly consented, when Dowling advised on the photocall (Ar-42). He set up Mater Dei Institute to have religion teachers and laity better informed in theology, but some saw it as an attempt to reinforce his own bastion of orthodoxy at Clonliffe and Mater Dei against his concern about Maynooth's orthodoxy (Ar-40). However, he allowed liberal theologians like Fagan and Father B to lecture in Mater Dei without interference. When the Hierarchy decided Catholics could attend weddings, baptisms and funerals of non-Catholic friends, McQuaid told Herlihy of Ferns: "It will take a lot of explaining to my people"(Ar-11). Again, on Cardinal Bea's draft directory on ecumenism, he pleaded Dublin's "special circumstances", saying ecumenism in Dublin was "a gravely delicate process" and that Bea was not the Archbishop of Dublin, where the situation needs "very delicate handling"(Ar-41).

Erosion

McQuaid offered no encouragement in this final stage. Gestures were offered courteously, especially to the Church of Ireland, but he seems to have given up the effort to adapt and change, possibly over disappointment at the widescale criticism and rejection of *Humanae Vitae*. He welcomed the encyclical with enthusiasm, and, unlike other bishops, such as Lucey in Cork and O'Boyle in Washington, he handled the fall-out better, was discreet with those whom he knew were not in full support, and avoided

public rebukes or sackings of his priests. He accepted the end of the Trinity College ban even though it went against his wishes, but he complained when the Bishops decided he must appoint a Chaplain at Trinity, "the first occasion on which the Episcopal Conference will have forced a measure on an individual bishop" (Ar-13). He accepted obediently the Pope's acceptance of his resignation, but pleaded and got an extension of one year, and was then surprised. Interviewees also expressed surprise, but MacMahon, alone, admitted that McQuaid was given the extension by the Pope, an extension which is stated in the correspondence with the Nuncio and the Secretary of State in Rome.

Summary

McQuaid identified the Council as a key issue for the Church and his diocese, and seems to have managed his diocese's responses to it (Baskin *et al* (1997:48) in terms of management being "to control and direct" (Ewing 1987). McQuaid lacked power over the development and presentation of the issue and, as the media became more pervasive, he could not control those who spoke and wrote about it, even in Dublin. Nor could he manipulate the actors through tactics such as censorship and vigilance committees. He would like to have been able to control the change himself (Battelle, Fagan), and he attempted vigorously to gain control over religious broadcasting on Telefis Eireann but, after a lengthy battle, he failed (Ar-25, 27, 28, 29). In the 1960s there was a new appetite for debate amongst the more intellectual Catholic public, even if their knowledge of theology was often slight, and they fed upon the dramatic media presentation of the Council and the views

of speculative theologians. Their interest was shown in packed attendances at Milltown Park public lectures and the small, but interested Group that McQuaid described as Fr. Flannery's "salon in my diocese". Gill, a religious publisher, witnessed it in the enthusiastic readership for "paperback theology". McQuaid could react to, but no longer control this development, and his traditional methods of censorship were no longer effective in the face of television and a more intelligent, quality press.

Public relations literature stresses the importance of two-way symmetrical communication, where there is a balanced relationship between an organisation and its publics, but Vercic & J.Grunig believe issue management writers create an asymmetrical position where there is an attempt to anticipate what issues publics and activists will create and then take action to defeat them (2000:42). McQuaid's communication was never two-way, either asymmetrical or symmetrical, it was one way – he was the old-fashioned teacher. He held his cards and, as MacMahon verifies, took advice but he alone had the full picture, the *übeblick*, of his position on any issue. For this reason, negotiation as proposed by Watson *et al* (2002) was never a feature of McQuaid's handling of the Council issue.

McQuaid's first pre-occupation was always for the "simple faithful" not to be upset. He didn't mind who attacked him as long as "The Faith" didn't suffer (Ar-79). Priests could look after themselves and "would be OK" (Butler) but he believed he had to maintain balance across both clergy and more educated laity who included a mixture of publics on the issue.

Gaughan appreciated this difficulty for McQuaid who knew there was not unanimity about change among clergy or laity, and being the man at the top, “it was difficult to drive a middle course”. This would be another reason why he moved slowly on the changes and why he had fewer negative and traditionalist reactions than in some other parts of the world (MacMahon). He could probably have given a better lead (Fitz-Patrick, Mac Réamoinn), and could have been more positive about the opportunities offered by the Council, instead of being on the defensive. The Public Image Committee regretted he was not giving “positive leadership that would give them [priests and faithful] pride and confidence in their Church (Ar-61).

STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC RELATIONSHIPS

Several authors adopt a cyclical approach for the origin, development, cultivation, outcomes and, possibly, eventual decline and break-up of a relationship (Broom Casey & Ritchey, 1997,2000; J.Grunig & Huang, 2000, Bruning & Ledingham, 2000). As with issue management models, Thomlison sees the process “seldom as simple or the transitions to other stages as quick as represented” in various types of relationship models (2000:188).

Antecedents

Antecedents are the influencing factors which bring participants together in a relationship (Broom Casey & Ritchey, 2000:16), but a Catholic diocese, with its bishop, priests and laity, shows differences from a commercial

organisation and its publics. In Dublin, in 1959, all had common “baggage” which they brought to the relationship, sharing the same Catholic faith which displayed itself in a high level of religious practice and obedience to authority. All were aware of the dominant position of the Catholic Church in Irish life and were used to a monolithic Church where change came, if at all, slowly and from the Pope. Laity held priests in respect and did not criticise them openly and were content with a clericalism which left church matters to be run by the clergy. Dublin, the largest diocese, was not Ireland but, with limited places in regional seminaries, it had many seminarians from other parts of Ireland, and the culture of its priests was therefore broader than Dublin city and county. As has been seen, the 1950s, economically and socially, were difficult in Ireland, with high levels of emigration and unemployment (Charles McCarthy 1969; Dermot Keogh *et al* 2004).

Expectations

In other spheres of life, people weigh up the costs and benefits arising in a relationship and their “baggage” affects expectations of each other (Ledingham & Bruning, 2001:530). This did not arise in Catholic Ireland entering the 1960s. Religion was God-given and inherited. Bishops, priests and laity all came from the same culture and the same communities, rural and urban.

Stack, like Charles McCarthy, remembers the sense of “immutability”. Not even those who were aware of the coming Council expected much to change in the life of the Church. There was early talk of what the Council would do for Christian unity, but the more common view was that unity had nothing to do with Catholics, but was a problem for Protestants who must recognise their error and return to the one true Church. The Irish Church was insulated from theological developments in Central and Northern mainland Europe, one reason why priests, like Stack, were so grateful for *The Furrow* and *Doctrine & Life*.

McQuaid was at the zenith of his power and influence during Patrician Year of 1961, hosting Cardinal Agagianian and presiding over the Croke Park extravaganza, stewarded by his Congress Volunteer Corps. He had a favourable relationship with his older priests who had witnessed his early reforms in the diocese and his great energy and charity. For many of them, he could do no wrong and their support was so strong that in more difficult times ahead they could ignore whatever contradicted this favourable reputation (Coombs & Holladay 2001:324). He did not have such a strong relationship with the younger priests, some of whom hardly knew him. He was close to the Knights of St. Columbanus, in aiding the poor, organising youth services, raising money and controlling the spread of evil literature and entertainment.

McQuaid was even more remote from ordinary laity than from younger priests and this was not expected to change. Their dealings were with local

priests and, and apart from Sunday Mass and confessions, usually limited to special occasions and periodic house visits. Parish priests were older men while parish administration, but rarely decision-making, was delegated to younger curates. Lay people criticised priests, as priests criticised the Archbishop, but it was usually in private. The press was uncritical and television had not arrived to create debate and challenge long-established traditions. McQuaid, priests and laity did not expect relationships to change and if the Church was to change, it might be a gradual updating of certain disciplines, and it would come from the Pope.

Indicators

Relationship indicators are seen as means of identifying the status of a relationship, with shifts and perceived changes in strength as relational outcomes (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998; Hutton, 1999; Hon and J.Grunig, 1999; Huang, 1997,2001). The literature review identified 106 relationship indicators, reduced finally to nine: trust, commitment, communality, communication, complexity, control, satisfaction, shared values and time (Appendix B, p. 541).

Trust is probably the most important indicator in any relationship, but on both sides of the McQuaid/priests relationship it was not often referred to as such, but described more as "loyalty" which resulted in "a high degree of obedience" (Ward). Nor was it always visible or expressed, consistent with

Vercic's view of it as a "hypothetical construct" not "directly observable"(2003:8). The sense of trust as "feeling that those in the relationships can rely on each other"(J.T.Wood 1995) was strong in McQuaid's Dublin. He did not respond to his critics, but vigorously defended his priests and laity when they were attacked (Ar-7). He also reiterated their loyalty, as in his message for the Pope's priestly jubilee in 1970.

As opposed to trust, one has to consider the presence of fear in McQuaid's relationships, a fear which he seemed not to discourage but to cultivate. The Public Image Committee referred to it (Ar-61) and Stack, Brophy and others recalled it vividly. For Dunn, who got on better with him than most others, there was "no man that I feared more"(1986:25). For Bibb & Kourdi, when trust is absent, risk is "something to be avoided" and "low-trust cultures" are characterised by fear of loss, fear of a mistake because of the repercussions and fear of losing one's job (2004:22). This element of fear was not unique to McQuaid or to Ireland. Holloway believes it is common to all religious systems which claim divine authority for their commandments and prohibitions, "with eternal punishment for those who disobey them". He sees fear as a "potent motivator of behaviour" and believes "the most effective systems will generally operate on the basis of consent, not coercion, voluntary acceptance, not imposed obedience"(1999:17) Awe was closely linked to fear of McQuaid, and it often seemed to lead to an "obsequiousness" that others found embarrassing, even "quite revolting"(Dermot McCarthy). McQuaid did not seem to see it as

obsequiousness when he denied Burke Savage's claim that clergy and laity told him what he wanted to hear while "cutting him to ribbons behind his back". He said what he received from clergy or laity that was "even consoling" was very small, and what was "laudatory extremely small" (Ar-79).

The strength of shared faith and shared values led to strength in the commitment and communality within these relationships. As priests said (Stack, Dermot McCarthy), they might have criticised McQuaid and been afraid of him but they shared the same faith and continued to accept his leadership. Mac Réamoinn found a remoteness of lay people from all bishops and, if there was any relationship with people, "they were condescending somewhat". Louis McRedmond said "respect" for clergy and "awe" of bishops was built into the laity. For Battelle, the laity were "very conservative" and "quite happy to let the priests handle the Church".

McQuaid's apparent certitude about everything, and his weakness as a communicator led to relationships that were unbalanced. This imbalance, as well as the authority and power vested in the Archbishop, and used so consciously by McQuaid, meant he was in control of all his relationships, but at the time neither priests nor laity would have expected it to be otherwise. Their faith assured them he was appointed by God as their teacher, their shepherd. The shepherd analogy, from the Bible, conditioned people, like sheep, to be submissive to their shepherd and controlled by him. This same conditioning, in the climate of the early 1960s, helped priests

find satisfaction in the relationship and in their work, and they were quite happy not to have too many dealings with McQuaid. As Stack, said, it they all shared the same faith and got on with their work.

Broom Casey & Ritchey (2000) emphasise complexity as a relationship indicator and it is relevant in McQuaid's case. It was assumed he was a complex person because he had such a vast network of relationships, admittedly formal, and because he seemed to know everything that happened in the diocese. But, on the other hand, he was consistent, utterly predictable, another result of his sense of certitude. Gaughan liked this about him, "incapable of spin", you knew where you were with him.

Time is an important indicator in bishop, priests, laity relationships, especially for a bishop who has been in office for many years and has secured his reputation. McQuaid's relationships, especially with older priests, had time to mature on both sides over his 31-year episcopacy. Memories of controversies lived on, but outstanding achievements were also remembered. Time is also important in the laity's dealing with the local priests, but less so. In the 1960s parish priests were rarely appointed before 60 years of age and people often knew the curates better, younger men who often remained in the same parish for many years. Lay relationships with priests were often not confined to parish boundaries and many active Catholics, including the more educated who were interested in religious matters, and shared certain common interests, had little dealings with their

parishes but joined groupings and socialised with priests of like mind, whether religious or diocesan.

Cultivation strategies

Hon and J.Grunig (1999) suggest the goal in managing relationships is to push each dimension in the 'right' direction. This was so in the McQuaid/priests/laity relationships, as they were led predominantly from McQuaid's end and he controlled everything. No matter what consultation procedures were in place, there could never be anything more than an appearance of symmetry. O'Hara describes relationships as vertical when those at the bottom cede control of all their actions and allow authorities to circumscribe their freedom (2004:92). McQuaid often took decisions regardless of advice, as when he went ahead with building the new wing at Clonliffe College (Father B). His approach was contrary to what some authors would advise, such as Leichty & Warner, that "of all the curses that inhabit the world, the desire for certainty probably is the worst"(2001:74), and Greenhalgh who is against managers using power because it "emphasises domination and submission"(2001:238-9). McQuaid, would undoubtedly say of these, as he said of Cardinal Bea, that they are "not the Archbishop of Dublin"(Ar-11).

Interviewees stress McQuaid's authoritarian exercise of power (Masterson, Fagan, Mac Réamoinn), but add that it was a very authoritarian time (Gaughan, Byrne). The Public Image Committee tried to persuade McQuaid that "knowledge about the background to public actions and the reasons for

the decision is regarded as a vital step in the creation and maintenance of a public image"(Ar-61), but he was convinced that authority should not give reasons and that obedience was more virtuous if it was blind.

McQuaid's central cultivation strategy was to control as much as he could and impose strict discipline on priests and laity. Sometimes it was a petty discipline, as symbolised in his insistence that priests always wear their hats (Connell). His initiative in getting Dunn and Forristal trained for television, and then setting up the Radharc documentary unit, showed his foresight about the coming importance and influence of television. His desire to gain control over religious broadcasting seemed justified to him because the station was in his diocese where he was the authority on religious matters. The correspondence with the Telefis Eireann director-general, Kevin McCourt and TE's insistence on appointing Fr. Romuald Dodd as Head of Religious Programmes, was a serious defeat for McQuaid (Ar-25).

"Control" recurs constantly in interviews and correspondence relating to McQuaid: Every single thing was controlled by him"(Father B); "...very much the man in control"(Connell). There is evidence for the perception that he had a lot of influence within University College, Dublin, especially through Monsignor Horgan (Ar-20, 60, 63).

He was proud of the strict censorship he exercised to keep from the people ideas and influences of which he might disapprove (Ar-19). He was annoyed when the editor of *The Standard*, a Catholic newspaper, contacted a

diocesan censor directly over an article for publication, insisting that "censorship is meant to be a secret process"(Ar-56). He would demand the removal of books from Catholic bookshops if he did not approve of them (Gill). He could say to a later Nuncio, Sensi, in 1965, that youth organisations were "almost entirely under Catholic control" and that communist literature was "confiscated on arrival"(Ar-21). The secret Vigilance ("V") committee of priests watched over lay people who were suspected of communism or liberalism. The Knights looked out for books, films and theatre shows that were seen as objectionable.

It was alleged that McQuaid used clerical appointments to punish priests who stepped out of line and were removed with a couple of days notice, and no reasons given, to remote parishes and "difficult" parish priests. Fehily was suddenly, publicly, and without explanation, changed from his high-profile post at DICS because of false information given to McQuaid and he admits it hurt, but it turned out to be the best thing that ever happened to him. Dermod McCarthy says he was "shafted" over the Radharc programmes. On the other hand, Ward says "everyone was moved with six days notice", and Battelle that "you never had time to say goodbye to the people".

In the face of such strong, strict exercise of power by McQuaid, the priests tended to be cautious and keep their heads down (Battelle, Griffin, Fagan). This caution was raised by the Public Image Committee which noted how "fear of a severe rebuke from authority" discouraged initiatives among the

priests and passivity was the “safest guarantee of an untroubled passage to good promotion”(Ar-61).

McQuaid had a consistent strategy of kindness to priests and laity, who were ill or otherwise in trouble and he was always “worried about the poor”(Fehily). In fact, his naïveté sometimes meant he was taken in by conmen who knew of his generosity (Father B. Gaughan). There was almost unanimous praise in the interviews for this aspect of McQuaid, although Fagan recalled priests saying they had to submit totally and even to “grovel”; otherwise McQuaid was not interested in their troubles. Connell emphasised his kindness to priests who were laicised. McQuaid was the first bishop in the country to introduce a common salary scale for priests, and arranged that the richer parishes would help the poorer parishes (Ar-61).

Lay people, such as Maeve McRedmond, have stressed McQuaid’s paternalism and they did not like it, but others have said he found it hard to adapt because he never worked in a parish nor had experience of meeting all sorts of people face-to-face (Gaughan). The Public Image Committee commented that bishops, presumably including McQuaid, did not seem sufficiently conscious of the “maturity and high standard of general education of many of our lay Catholics” and at times offended them by treating them as if they were immature and uneducated (Ar-61).

McQuaid was in favour of involving the laity, provided always, that he had ultimate control. He told the Public Image Committee that it was a "grave misconception" to see the Church as made up of bishops, priests and nuns, with the bishop often "regarded as the Church"(Ar-61). Lay people were involved in primary schools and the teaching of religion, admittedly under a chairman who was usually the parish priest, but contrary to some perceptions, McQuaid also trusted lay people to run secondary schools, saying "if the Church flourishes in this country it is due to the lay teachers"(Ar-10). His support for the Knights and the Legion of Mary showed his encouragement of lay organisations as long as he could control them.

Outcomes

To assess outcomes in the public relationships between archbishop, priests and laity, one must look for indicator shifts in either direction, following Ledingham & Bruning who see "relationship dimensions as both building blocks of organisation-public relationships and as indicators of relationship quality"(2000:66).

Trust, shown in loyalty and obedience, was the strongest and most consistent indicator in these relationships. Priests seem to have retained this loyalty and obedience although they became more likely to criticise and question McQuaid's views and actions in private. Several confirmed that their relationship with him became stronger (Fehily, Ward, Murray, Connell, Gaughan). For some, loyalty increased as he was subjected to more

and more of what they saw as unfair media criticism. It is likely, however, that he was becoming less trusting towards some, priests and laity, who were active publics on the Council issue. He told Butler he was not going to allow any "experimentation" with the liturgy in his diocese and this would extend to ecumenism as seen in his annoyance when Mac Réamoinn read the lesson at the Martin Luther King service. The unrest, even disloyalty, of some priests was evident in their efforts to have his resignation accepted and their preferred successor appointed. There would have been very little shift in trust, loyalty and obedience among the mass of the "simple faithful".

Commitment could be indicated in the fidelity of priests to their ministry when there was already turmoil in other parts of the world. McQuaid told the Catholic Communications Institute that in the five years, 1966-1970 inclusive, only ten Dublin priests from nearly 600 left ministry (Ar-14).

Communality, seen as sharing, was strengthened as the laity now saw themselves as the Church, The People of God, and wanted greater involvement in the running of the parish. This change was evident but not so easily implemented (Fitz-Patrick, Gaughan, Fehily, Battelle).

Communication remained a problem for McQuaid and he was not at ease with the new era of press and television. He developed a greater realisation of the importance of communication, as seen in his encouragement and support of the Radharc project and the establishment of the Press Office. His pastorals were criticised but he could get his message across, and he was

listened to when he had something important to say. Gaughan particularly commended McQuaid's direct style of communicating because there was "no spin". He remained that way to the end, with the final letters against contraception saying the passing of legislation to allow it "would be and would remain a curse upon the country". It would seem that the improved religious journalism and television programmes like the *Late Late Show* created a climate for better, two-way communication and had a strong influence on relationships (Corish).

Complexity was a debatable feature of these relationships, as very few priests or laity knew McQuaid well and their relationships tended to be basic, while remaining remote and formal. McQuaid, the man and the mask, as described by Feeney (1974) came across as an enigma but not complex, as he was consistent and predictable and everybody knew where they stood with him. Whyte remained puzzled as to how the courteous and kindly gentleman whom he interviewed at length could be reconciled with the "waspy letters and verbal rebukes" which he knew him to have produced (Ar-82).

Control remained an important indicator of the relationships, possibly stronger in McQuaid's own mind than in reality because he had become "less effective as the world around him changed" (Battelle) and he "very much lost control as the torch passed to a new generation of people" (McCarthy). McQuaid allowed very little flexibility towards change at parish level, such as introduction of parish councils and lay participation

in ceremonies, and when he had options, he slowed down the pace of liturgical change, as reported by McRedmond (1969). Many priests of all ages retained their fear of McQuaid and kept their heads down lest they be reported to him. Fear had diminished among the laity, as it was now acceptable to continue the openness of debate on Church issues that the Council had started. In Biever's analysis (1965, 1976) there was a very uneven local relationship with priests firmly in control and tending to retain a superior attitude. The laity, reverent and deferent, acquiesced in this control. These relationships were "beginning to thaw a little bit" and there was greater evenness towards the end (Battelle).

Satisfaction within the relationship was reflected in the priests' commitment already mentioned. Some might take Flannery's highlighting of the large drop in numbers attending Mass in the city centre as a sign of reduced satisfaction among lay people. He believes this was not proof that they had lost their traditional faith but that in a less closely-knit urban environment it was becoming more acceptable not to go to Mass.

Shared values remained a strong feature, with all of the priests having been trained in the same seminary system, and McQuaid in a similar one, where the culture was traditional and conservative. The laity were also conservative, with Curtin believing the "vast majority of them continued as they were" and Father C and Dermod McCarthy giving particular examples. All shared the same Catholic faith, but as the 1960s progressed, the laity

were more prepared to challenge both Archbishop and priests (Louis McRedmond).

Time, the final suggested indicator, was a factor in the unswerving loyalty of the older priests and many adult laity. They had a long experience of McQuaid and, recognising his undisputed record of achievement and deserved reputation, they continued to live happily with that good relational history.

2

Causes of relational change

Ireland changed in the 1960s in many ways – political, economic, social, educational, cultural, religious. It was a decade of rapid change in the whole world. Masterson sees Vatican II as just “one factor in a dramatic process of change” in Ireland, but “part of a general ferment of change”. Corish stresses communication, especially television and the *Late Late Show*, as probably the most important factor in those “gales” of change, although Gay Byrne questions that.

Consideration of McQuaid’s management of the Council and its influence on his public relationships leads to recent theories on public relations field dynamics where Springston & Keyton (2001) hold that every act of behaviour takes place in a larger context that is part of an interactive field, meaning that any strategy directed to one public must be selected while keeping in mind the potential impact on other publics in the field. At the centre of this theory is “the notion of a fluid field encompassing all relevant

actors”(2001:117). Carty suggests, likewise, that a single issue and a single relationship cannot be considered in isolation. The world is more complex than that, with any field at any time containing numerous issues and numerous actors, all going through their cyclical processes at the same time and interacting with each other, but the actors at any one time being in different phases of those cycles, and relational episodes piercing through the cycles and having different impacts on the actors (2003 – see Appendix E pp. 584-604). Coombs also looks at this question and how analysis of cause and effect in relationships is influenced by “the fact that organisations have to manage multiple relationships simultaneously...Changes in one organisation-stakeholder relationship can spill over into another relationship. The challenge is to manage a constellation of stakeholder relationships”(2001:114).

In this study, the Vatican Council was the central issue, and it went through an entire first-generation life cycle, but it was not in isolation, there were many other issues and relationships interacting and influencing the Council issue and each other, all at different phases in different life cycles for different people. Stages in one issue could be seen as relational episodes in others and often having unforeseen influences upon them.

One could overestimate McQuaid’s influence on priests or laity in the 1960s when a lot of change seemed to have passed him by. Cooney (1999b) probably overestimated McQuaid’s power and influence, even in his early years, while Feeney (1974) got closer to the apparent contradictions between

the public man and the private man, an intriguing, sensitive and even endearing man, but quite vulnerable and deeply hurt by his 'enemies'.

McQuaid dominated life in Dublin over his long episcopacy, his style of rule was autocratic, politicians were influenced by, and even submissive to, his wishes. That was true, but not surprising as he was probably the last in a long line of dominant, aggressive Irish bishops who saw all to do with education, politics and everything that might affect their people as their rightful domain. McQuaid realised that, by tradition, he had been given great power and influence and he endeavoured to use it. McQuaid seems a throwback to that era of 'political' bishops, but a much milder version when compared, for example, with Cardinal Cullen of Dublin (1852-78).

In studying McQuaid's relationships, the element of fear among priests and laity can be exaggerated. The priests were intelligent men, doing their daily work, but the "fear" of McQuaid became such a legend, especially among those who did not know him, that it never lifted. The laity had a long tradition of deference to and reverence for their bishops and priests, and much has been made of their reaction to *Humanae Vitae* and McQuaid's final three letters against the proposed legislation to legalise contraception. It was not the first time that Irish people had disagreed with their bishops especially when it included a matter of politics. Also, there were other smaller incidents which showed that the Dublin people, despite the aura of McQuaid, did not hesitate to make up their own mind when they disagreed with him and felt he had gone beyond his domain. Politicians, knowing the influence that bishops traditionally had with so many people, were only

being prudent when they considered episcopal attitudes in advance of legislation.

The changes in the 1960s in Ireland brought a new generation of younger politicians. Commins' reports from the Vatican, criticising the Irish bishops for their "supine and reserved" attitude at the Council and their lack of leadership or impact, may have been a factor in these politicians realising that bishops were no longer the force they had been (Ar-2). They certainly acted that way when they proposed the Dublin university merger in 1967. McQuaid welcomed the idea of the merger because he believed it would finally be the end of Protestant Trinity College. But as the debate went on, he was shocked when he heard the NUI Senate had accepted that the Trinity ban would go and "he had been left in the dark"(Ar-7).

Reviewing impact of relational episodes

The research process delivered 13 relational episodes which over the period 1959 to 1972 might have had influence upon the public relationships between Archbishop, priests and laity. Some of them were directly related to and part of the Council and had an important impact on the aware and active publics, but it is harder to demonstrate a shift caused by any of them within the wider stakeholder relationships. It is worth remembering that "inputs into a relationship are not directly linked to outputs and that sometimes big changes can come from small events and these can happen quickly, with the reverse also true"(Gladwell, 2000:11). It is also important

to consider Broom & Dozier's view that the impact of relational episodes is constantly assumed but rarely proved (1990:82).

It would seem that some of these episodes improved McQuaid's relationships with certain priests and laity, others damaged them, and others had little obvious influence. The Council undoubtedly had an influence on the relationships, as it was a prominent and widely-publicised issue throughout, but it cannot be isolated. It remains conjecture what would have happened without a Council. It is unlikely that other changes in Irish society would have been halted or hindered. Certainly those who took such an interest in the Council and its desire to open up the Church to engage with the modern world, could not have foreseen the storms of the next few decades, but they are the material for other researchers. Fuller (2002:xiii) and Hoban (2004:117) attempted but were not able to give a final verdict on what change might have happened anyway in the Irish Catholic Church, with or without the Council, or what might have happened if the Archbishop of Dublin had not been John Charles McQuaid.

Verdict

It would seem, in answer to the original research question, that the shift in overall stakeholder relationships, if any, could not be attributed to McQuaid's handling of the Council issue, but there was some influence on relationships with active publics on the issue. The admittedly fine distinction between stakeholders and publics is useful in explaining this position. However relationships may have been influenced less by what

McQuaid did and said, and by how he imposed his teaching authority, than by the overall development of the media of communication from which priests and laity, certainly those active on the issue, nourished their attitudes on the Council, the Archbishop and the Church.

13: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THIS FINAL CHAPTER is a summary of conclusions that may validly be drawn from the findings and discussion, followed by some reflections and recommendations for further research. The thesis has examined Archbishop McQuaid's management of the Vatican Council issue in Dublin and the extent, if any, to which it influenced change in the relationships between archbishop, priests and laity over the years 1959 to 1972.

THEORETICAL RELEVANCE AND VALIDITY

- The principles and processes of issue and relationship management theories in public relations literature have been found workable within a religious context different from that of the commercial business sector for which they were primarily framed.
- The phenomenon examined was one of major importance within the Roman Catholic Church where public relationships have traditionally been hierarchical and vertical, with submission upwards, in a spirit of faith, loyalty and obedience.
- The traditional concepts of power and authority, and their use in the Church, distorted to some extent, but did not destroy, the normal pattern of public relationships.

- Archbishop McQuaid was an authoritarian manager, exercising a style that was common in his time, and he was not inclined towards two-way symmetrical communication, or to consultation and discussion.
- However, the general patterns in his handling of the Council issue loosely reflected the five stages in the original Chase/Jones issue management process.
- The period studied, 1959 to 1972, was sufficient to identify a complete first-generation life cycle of the Council issue. The Femers model of phases in the life cycle, from emergence, dissemination and establishment to erosion, with the overlaps that are normal in such treatment, was considered to be a more suitable frame than the Regester and Larkin depiction.
- The examination has also followed the relationship management process patterns identified by Ledingham, Bruning and other writers through antecedents and expectations, indicators, cultivation strategies and outcomes identified through change over time in the indicators and used as a yardstick for qualitative evaluation.
- A high degree of stability was retained in the relationships, with an overriding positive indicator of trust, manifested in loyalty and obedience, amid significant advances in communication and an accelerated pace of change in all walks of Irish life at the time.
- Fear of those in authority, still a feature of many public relationships in the 1960s, and not just within the Catholic Church, was a strong negative indicator within these relationships.

McQUAID – MAN AND MANAGER

There is confirmation of seemingly contradictory aspects of McQuaid's personality and management style.

- He was an outstanding, efficient, and even revolutionary administrator and a forceful, strategic thinker, looking ahead and recognising sooner than others the importance of oncoming issues.
- He sought control of every situation he was involved in, was authoritarian and often severe in his management style, placing high importance on unquestioning obedience and strong discipline.
- He was kind and charitable, always solicitous for the individual person and their welfare, especially those who were under-privileged, poor, sick or in trouble of any sort.
- In religious matters, he was predominantly solicitous for that vast majority of his people to whom he referred as the 'simple faithful'. He was their 'shepherd' and his utmost concern was that they would not be confused or disturbed in their religious faith and practice and that he would pass on to them and their children the 'deposit of faith', untarnished and intact.
- The public man could be very different from the private man, with a concentration on ceremonial and formality, and servants administering to him, all that he saw as proper respect for the office of bishop, but which was viewed by some as arrogance and vanity.
- He had a charismatic and enduring impact upon those who knew him closely, or even only met him closely once or twice. He is still 'The

Archbishop' to many and one priest referred repeatedly to his 'pontificate'.

Certitude

There is fresh evidence here that certitude, even in impossible situations, was a strong influence in John Charles McQuaid's life:

- He had certitude that, as Archbishop, he was the sole teaching authority on faith and morals in his diocese, appointed by God and led by God, so that his teaching could not be in error.
- He did not want to be seen to change, especially under pressure, because that could imply that his previous teaching was now in error and his credibility as a teacher could be undermined.
- His certitude, even in private conversation, was such that he prepared topics even before informal and social meetings and then insisted on taking the lead and having the last word. His encyclopedic memory and grasp of detail helped him in this. Friends did not remember him ever admitting to be wrong or not to know something.
- He sought certitude in his spiritual life and relationship with God. His spiritual director told him in 1930 of his recurring tendency to seek an impossible certitude of the senses in his spiritual life and an impossible knowledge of his progress. His director rebuked him for falling back into this tendency even when it was pointed out to him as false. He probably never lost this anxiety for spiritual certitude.
- He had feelings of insecurity, probably since discovering that his mother had died a week after his birth, and this may have been a factor in his

apparent loneliness, with reluctance to let down his guard and reveal his true emotions.

HOW McQUAID MANAGED THE VATICAN COUNCIL ISSUE

Positive

- He gave priority to the Council as an issue during and between its four sessions (1962-1965) and afterwards.
- He attended every meeting at every session of the Council and examined in detail all of the documentation.
- He identified, as his most important stakeholder group, the 'simple faithful', that is the majority of the 800,000 lay people in his diocese, who would have neither knowledge nor understanding of the theological matters raised by the Council.
- He sought to reassure these people that the Council would not disturb their Catholic Faith.
- There were indications of openness to change, including some change in attitude, from 1964 to 1968, and the suggestion that this was merely gestures without substance cannot be fully substantiated.
- He accepted every decree and decision of the Council and implemented it in his diocese in obedience to the Pope and the Vatican authorities.
- He implemented the Council gradually, and with caution, aware that there was not unanimity about change among priests or laity, and that

too much change too rapidly or too little change too late could disturb sections of both priests and laity.

- In the controversy following the Papal encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*, which retained the Catholic Church ban on artificial contraception, he exercised prudence in his management of its backlash and avoided the dissent and open rebellion that occurred in some dioceses of the world.
- The certitude, which McQuaid brought to every aspect of his life, applied also to the way he handled the Council. He acted with singular motive and sincere conviction and believed what he did was correct, even in the face of often harsh criticism in some sections of the media.

Negative

- McQuaid, along with other Irish bishops, was slow to identify the Council and its implications as an issue.
- He failed to prepare his priests and laity adequately for the Council.
- When the Council became an issue he adopted reactive strategies and saw it more as a problem than an opportunity.
- As he was not enthusiastic about the Council, and fearing rather than welcoming it, he often adopted silence as a tactic rather than giving positive leadership and educating priests and people to the new, more open Church that the Council was trying to create. However, he issued some topical and generally supportive pastoral letters, notably on the idea of a Council in 1963 and on the Sacred Liturgy in 1964.
- He did not realise sufficiently that management of the Council issue had to take into account not just broad, static stakeholder groups like the

800,000+ lay people or the 500+ priests, but the dynamic publics created by the Council issue because of the consequences they perceived it could have for them.

- He was impatient with active publics, among both priests and laity, who sought to have more radical change and have it more quickly.
- He failed to enter into genuine dialogue with those whose outlook on the Council he did not share.
- He did not appreciate sufficiently the honesty and good will of those priests and lay people whom he would have seen as liberals or progressives.
- He attempted, unsuccessfully, to restrict the circulation of new theological positions which were being promoted by speculative, liberal theologians through publications, lectures and radio and television.
- As he grew older, finding it more difficult to adapt, he became more feeble in his attempt to manage the issue.

Judgement

It is difficult to make a judgement on the Council, and even on McQuaid's handling of it, as success or failure have different meanings for liberals and conservatives, with many other positions in between. The Council issue, destined from the start to become permanently embedded in history, remains a cyclical one, so that its long-term effects could not have been predicted at the time, nor even now, more than 40 years on. McQuaid, in protecting the 'simple faithful', seems to have succeeded in the short-term, although there were signs of fall in Mass attendance and other church

devotions. He also kept his team of priests intact, with very few resignations until after he had retired. He went ahead in his own way, no matter who criticised him, and made all of the changes that were decreed.

RELATIONSHIP CHANGE

Archbishop and priests

- Trust, demonstrated in loyalty and obedience, remained the central feature on both sides of this relationship, with McQuaid prompt to defend his priests and proclaim their fidelity.
- There was very little change, if any, in McQuaid's relationship with most of his priests, indeed it was strengthened in many cases, especially among those who had the opportunity to work closely with him and know him.
- In the years after the Council there was a noticeable impatience on the part of some priests, especially younger ones who did not have a close relationship with McQuaid, and they believed he was unnecessarily slow in implementing the Council changes and compared unfavourably with more liberal bishops in other countries.
- This impatience led eventually to a degree of disloyalty, on the part of some priests, and it became more open as talk of McQuaid's impending retirement and the likelihood of who might be his successor, became a topic of conversation among priests and laity and in the media.
- The manner in which some abandoned him after retirement showed their loyalty and obedience had been only to the office, not the man.

- Fear on the priests' side, young and old, remained a feature of the relationship, or at least nobody gave evidence that it did not linger to the end.
- McQuaid remained a well-liked, and even a saintly person for some who were close to him, while they accepted to the end that he was strict, precise and not willing to be contradicted or engaged in dialogue.
- His relationships and communication with the priests were rarely symmetrical or balanced and this did not change. The priests generally kept their heads down for fear of rebuke.

Archbishop and laity

- He remained a remote, and even invisible figure, to most of the laity.
- He underestimated the sincerity with which the more intellectual laity responded to the Council and its message for the world and their ability to appreciate theological issues and think for themselves.
- His changed attitude to Vincent Grogan, Supreme Knight of St. Columbanus, was in large part a result of Grogan's liberal attitudes and desire to bring *aggiornamento* and change to the Knights.
- Likewise, the consolidation of his support for the Legion of Mary, and a change from suspicion to enthusiastic support and encouragement, would have reflected the conservative attitudes of Frank Duff, their founder and leader.
- The extent to which the laity were afraid of him diminished over these years, and they were becoming more willing to criticise him publicly and to disobey him.

- The media did not create the Council as an issue but they popularised and spread it and they tended to be more on the side of the liberals who were their principal sources.
- His relationship with the media remained sensitive and he never fully understood the work of journalists, but formed a good friendship with *Irish Press* editor, Tim Pat Coogan, which tolerated some exchange of views, even on contraception.

Priests and laity

- While the traditional deference and reverence on the part of the laity was retained, there was a softening in the relationship with priests, especially parish priests, moving down somewhat from the superior pedestal that Irish society had afforded to them in days when the laity were less educated.
- Growing numbers of the laity sought practical involvement in the administration and ministry of the parishes, as invited by the Council which proclaimed them to be the Church, the People of God.
- Priests, especially some older ones, not being used to consultation, nor trained to it, were slow to understand how the greater lay involvement could be exercised.
- Lay people, aware of the Council debates and realising that bishops and priests did not necessarily agree on all interpretations of Catholic doctrine and discipline, became more articulate and public in expressing their views, particularly through meetings, books, broadcasting and press.

- Many laity chose the *Humanae Vitae* episode to contradict the Pope and disobey his ruling on contraception, even when it was fully endorsed by the archbishop, but not by all of the priests.
- The falling Mass attendance, especially in the city, could indicate that the bonds, strongly built upon fear, and often intimidation, were loosening.

INFLUENCE OF McQUAID'S COUNCIL ISSUE

MANAGEMENT UPON PUBLIC RELATIONSHIPS

- There is insufficient evidence to show if there was a shift in the broad stakeholder group relationships.
- The impact of the Council was strong on all Catholics who were aware or active publics on it, and, in many cases, it made them less docile to Church authority and more critical, but it cannot be proved how different their response to that impact would have been had McQuaid handled it otherwise.
- There is strong evidence that, while the media, both specialist and popular, did not create the issue of the Council, they played an important part in rolling it along and all active, and many aware publics, were influenced by the coverage in the absence of mature guidance from their bishops. In general, they were disappointed that McQuaid's enthusiasm for change did not line up with their expectations, and this then influenced their relationships with him. McQuaid was critical of the media and could have been more positive in realising its good effects

and how the sincere interest in the Council and in theology among a growing number of the laity could have been harnessed.

- McQuaid's management of the Council issue had some influence on his relationships with priests and laity, but cannot be isolated due to the many other issues and factors, including communication, television, education and increasing prosperity, that were influencing change in Ireland over the years in question.
- The media at the Council played a part in opening out the secrecy which had surrounded its initial phases and this led to demand for greater transparency in Church governance, something that the Curia had never countenanced before. This fed a desire also to have transparent governance at the local diocesan and parish level, and in time this was to come.
- It might not be extreme, in the light of the evidence produced here, to suggest that the new, more intelligent religious journalism, covering all of the media of communication, had possibly a greater influence on attitudes of the active and more aware clerical and lay publics than anything McQuaid did or said, regardless of his traditional use of his teaching authority and continuing imposition of strict discipline.

FINAL REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The idea for this thesis arose partly from an interest in the way heroes in their lifetime often become villains soon after their deaths and vice versa, because of one dominant, controversial issue and the way they handled it.

Recent years have seen a new industry of emotional and sometimes unfair revisionism.

The methods used in this thesis have included in-depth interviews with reliable survivors of the experience, study of the relevant archives and linkage with secondary sources and the application of tools of analysis that are widely covered in public relations literature. Could they be used for a better understanding of other recent issues and relationship changes in such fields as history, religion and science? Could they help to reconstruct the past without deconstructing the players?

This led to the question of John Charles McQuaid and the Second Vatican Council, twin topics which greatly interested me as a clerical student (Holy Ghost Fathers, 1958 to 1965) and then a religious journalist until 1972. How did McQuaid handle the Council? What impact did this have on his priests and laity? Would the current principles of general management and of public relations, that have been developed mainly since those years, hold good if McQuaid were examined in the light of them? Could these principles be applied to other phenomena of the recent past?

One suggestion in this thesis has been that basic management principles are as ancient as civilisation and have been illustrated repeatedly in the strategies of political, military, industrial and religious rulers. This indicates that, while the means of communication and technology improve, the principles of management remain essentially the same but are re-phrased

constantly in ways that make sense to each new generation with its 'modern' worldview and methods of discourse.

It would seem that the methods of this thesis could be applied to other situations where there are a significant and balanced number of reliable survivors. It would have to be a major issue which made a very strong impact on its participants and witnesses. People interviewed for this thesis had no difficulty remembering those stirring events for the Catholic Church in the 1960s, just as more recent revelations of child sex abuse by clerics will remain large in people's minds long after the immediate emotion and sense of shame has died down.

I believe this thesis has painted a fair and valid picture of McQuaid. He was part of the folklore of my youth, as of so many other people in Dublin. He loomed larger than life. We believed he was all-seeing and all-knowing and had his gaze on everybody, an amazing, but daunting, charisma. There was a feeling of relief, in a way, when his press officer, O.G. ("Ossie") Dowling met me at Butt Bridge in Dublin, just one hour after the retirement was announced on 4 January 1972. Ossie was doing the rounds of the newspaper offices and he gave me his story with the excitement of a schoolboy.

It is to McQuaid's credit that he steered a middle, cautious road, certainly upsetting some who favoured rapid change but also others who wanted no change and who afterwards joined traditionalist groupings like the Society of St. Pius X, which became a small splinter from the Roman Catholic

Church. McQuaid held his priests and laity together while he remained as Archbishop, although much changed after his lifetime. There were some younger priests, impatient for his retirement, who lobbied openly for it, and were unkind to him, as illustrated in the way they ignored him as he lived his last days in apparent loneliness with just a few close and loyal friends who kept in touch with him. It might be dramatic to say that the final media attack on his life's work killed him, but several of his close friends believed this was so and Desmond Connell remarked to Archbishop Ryan that in that instance, as always, McQuaid did the most dignified thing – he died.

A THEORETICAL DIVERSION

This thesis led to an interesting diversion along the way. Examination of the literature led me to believe that there was a gap within it. The interaction of issues and public relationships was far more complex than many writers assumed. They were over-simplifying the picture and neglecting the fact that in every instance there were many issues, many actors, many relationships, many episodes interacting at the same time. This meant it was difficult, even impossible, to manage one issue in isolation, no matter what priority was given to it.

Writers like Chase and Ewing had painted a very black-and-white picture of reality and it was no wonder that when Grunig developed his situational theory of publics, he found that it was rarely possible to predict the behaviour of publics, regardless of whether they were latent, aware or active or even non-publics on a particular issue. Everything was affecting

everything else at the same time. It may be that the theory of Public Relations Field Dynamics, as developed recently by Springston and Keyton, is getting to grips with the question. I developed my own position somewhat in the paper I presented to the UK Chartered Institute of Public Relations conference at Bournemouth in 2003 and in subsequent revised treatments. It has been included as Appendix E (p. 584). To have taken it into the promised territory of chaos and complexity theory would have been outside my depth and expertise at this time and would have diverted me from my main thesis. It may be a fruitful research project for the future.

The aims and objectives of the thesis have been accomplished but not with extreme or simple answers. There is a fog, a mingling with so many other influences, that leaves a certain "mushiness" in any attempt to evaluate McQuaid, the Council and the influence upon the relationships with his priests and laity.